DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 924 95 SO 011 287

TITLE	Citizen Education Today. Draft.
INSTITUTION	National Center for Voluntary Action, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[78]
CONTRACT	300-77-0039
NOTE	173p.; Not available in hard copy from EDRS due to varied ink density in original document
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Changing Attitudes; Childhood Attitudes; Citizen Participation; *Citizenship; Data Analysis; Decision Making; Democratic Values; Educational Assessment; *Educational History; Educational Improvement; *Educational Objectives; Educational Policy; Educational Practice; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Global Approach; Governance; Government Role; Information Needs; Knowledge Level; Political Issues; Political Socialization; *Program Descriptions; Skill Development; *Social Studies; State of the Art Reviews

ABSTRACT

The document views citizenship education from the perspectives of the past and present and offers recommendations for improving citizenship education programs. The document is presented in three chapters, preceeded by an introductory essay highlighting major developments in citizenship education in the United States since the colonial period. Chapter I focuses on the challenges of citizen education today. The major challenge is developing citizen competence. Major considerations of citizenship education are described, including increasing social complexity, global interdependence, and conflicting interpretations of the subject area. Chapter II reviews the level of desired civic competency and provides illustrations of representative programs in schools, media, government, labor, religious organizations, and business. Chapter III reviews findings from research on citizenship education and offers recommendations to improve citizenship education programs. It is recommended that citizenship education programs will improve if the federal government and local communities convene commissions on citizen education. These commissions should involve members of the research community and representatives of a wide cross section of American society. Commission members would be responsibile for developing criteria and for clarifying educational frameworks and objectives for citizenship education programs. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED162924

DRAFT

SO

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Elizabeth Farquhar
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

NOV 30 1978

CITIZEN EDUCATION TODAY

SO-011287

This report is the first phase of an effort by the U.S. Office of Education to identify the challenge of citizen education in contemporary America. It was prepared by the National Center for Voluntary Action under contract with the Office of Education. The opinions expressed herein are those of the contractor and the authors, with technical editing provided by the Office of Education. No official endorsement of the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

The contract number is 300-77-0039

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWARD i

CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS.....ii

INTRODUCTION: THE HISTORICAL FRAMEWORK.....iii
Richard Remy

CHAPTER I: THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION TODAY..... 1
Richard Remy

CHAPTER II: THE STATUS OF CITIZEN EDUCATION.....37
Howard Mehlinger and John Patrick

CHAPTER III PART A: RECOMMENDATIONS WITH COMMENTARY..... 84
PART B: SUMMARY OF SELECTED RESEARCH.....109
Steve McCurley and Judith Torney

APPENDIX A: LETTER REQUESTING RECOMMENDATIONS.....148

APPENDIX B: PARTIAL LISTING OF PERSONS RECEIVING RECOMMENDATION REQUEST.....151

APPENDIX C: TASK FORCE MEMBERS JANUARY 1977.....160

FOREWARD

The Introduction to the Report contains an historical view of citizenship education in America. Chapter I, prepared by Richard C. Remy, examines the contemporary context of citizenship education, and illustrates major considerations and paradoxes. Chapter II, by Howard Mehlinger and John Patrick, reviews relevant assessment data concerning the level of civic competency, and provides illustrations of representative programs and activities. Chapter III, prepared by Steve McCurley and Judith Torney, with research assistance from Ana Toro and Patrick Brice, presents recommendations for the enhancement of citizenship education, with selected research findings pertinent to those recommendations.

In submitting the report to the Office of Education, Kerry Kenn Allen, Executive Director, National Center for Voluntary Action, stated:

> Although this project was sponsored by a government agency, it is not the view of the authors that government alone should be responsible for implementing these Recommendations. Indeed, one of the central themes of this report is the responsibility of all sectors of society toward citizen education. It is hoped that this report Recommendations will generate further discussion. If the people are to act as the 'safe depository' then they must be prepared to confront the challenges involved. Citizen education must become a major priority as we seek to renew individual commitment to problem-solving.

Citizen Education Staff
U.S. Office of Education

CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS

Steve McCurley is Research and Legislative Analyst for the National Center for Voluntary Action.

Howard Mehlinger is Director of the Social Studies Development Center and Professor of History and Education at Indiana University. During 1977, he also served as the President of the National Council for the Social Studies. He is the author of numerous articles and books relating to social studies education.

John J. Patrick is Associate Professor of Education at Indiana University. He has written numerous articles about civic education for scholarly publications. He is co-author of a college textbook on methods of teaching high school social studies. He is also co-author of a widely used high school textbook about American government and politics.

Richard C. Remy is Director of the Citizenship Development Program at the Mershon Center, Ohio State University. He concurrently holds appointments as an Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science and the Faculty of Humanities Education at Ohio State. He is the author of numerous articles on political socialization and civic education, and is the co-author of an innovative civics program for elementary school teachers.

Judith Torney is Professor of Psychology at the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle. She is the author of numerous articles and books in the field of civic education and is an editorial board member of several professional journals.

Maureen Aspen, Director of National Affairs for the National Center for Voluntary Action, served as project coordinator.

INTRODUCTION:

THE HISTORICAL FRAMEWORK

Richard C. Remy

Throughout history, educators, scholars and policy-makers have shown concern for citizenship education. For every society faces the challenge of developing citizens equipped with the knowledge, skills, attitudes and experiences requisite to effective and responsible participation in the life of their society. Further, a society with democratic aspirations must facilitate and sustain the involvement of its citizens throughout their lives.

The American response to the challenge of citizenship education has varied over time in accordance with issues and needs facing society. How have our predecessors approached the task of developing citizen competence? Educational historian R. Freeman Butts has described four periods in the evolution of citizenship education in America.[1] Let us briefly examine each of these.

The Revolutionary Period (1776-1826). The founding fathers saw the task of citizenship education as primarily that of fostering national cohesion. They advocated a common program of literacy and the inculcation of love of country and devotion to the public good for all children who came to school. For a new nation, the needs of an emerging democratic republican society took precedence over the uses of knowledge for self-improvement or occupational preparation.

Thus citizenship education during America's first 50 years strongly emphasized the inculcation of civic values, with less emphasis on political knowledge as such, and still less on the development of participation and inquiry skills. The structure and functions of government were rarely distinguished and the performance of political leaders was not studied or evaluated.

The founders saw free, common public schools as a device for providing an education suitable to citizenship in the new nation. The common schools, however, were mainly concentrated in New England during this period. In other parts of the country, citizenship education was imparted by the family, and by religious denominations, as well as private schools for the wealthy and charity schools for the poor.

For some, cultural traditions prescribed unique forms of training. American Indian tribes used practical experience for the acceptance of group responsibility. At the earliest possible age children were given the chance to practice basic tasks necessary to function competently in their culture. This direct, experience-based education continued until the young were called upon, usually in puberty or early adolescence, to show they had attained the necessary proficiency to be accepted as responsible adult members of their society.[2]

Post Revolutionary Era (1826-1876). During the next era, approaches to citizenship education did not change drastically. Civic values such as liberty, equality and patriotism continued to be a prime focus of attention. Additional stress was placed upon the virtues of hard work, honesty and individual effort.

But by the 1840's educational policy-makers started to respond to problems brought on by America's budding pluralism and modernization. Particularly in the East, as urban life developed in conjunction with the industrial factory system, the distinctions between cherished civic values and the actual operation of the political system started to be apparent to educational policy-makers.

Horace Mann's attempt to wrestle with these new issues exemplified the emerging dilemma facing educators of the time. On the one hand, Mann feared that the growing political strife in the community outside school would find expression in citizenship instruction within the schools. On the other hand, he could not forsake the belief that public schools had an important role to play in the task of citizenship education. His solution was to propose that schools teach the common elements agreed to by all, but omit controversial topics. Traditional values and knowledge about the structure of governmental institutions would be taught in school. Controversial ideas, critical judgments about the performance of the political system and participation skills would be the province of political parties, the press and other non-school agencies.

Freeman Butts explains that:

> Mann...would not risk the failure of the common s[illegible]ol idea in order to bring political controversy into the schools. Thus it came about that the emerging public schools were largely content with a civic program that initiated...children into the political community by literacy in English, didactic moral injunction, patriotic readers and lessons that stressed recitation of the structural forms of the constitutional order.[3]

By the centennial in 1876 America was becoming an increasingly complex society and the task of citizenship education was becoming more problematical.

Immigration, Modernization and World Power (1876-1945). By the turn of the century at least three interrelated forces were shaping the task of citizenship education. First, the United States was becoming a world power sure of its "manifest-destiny" and set upon making the world "safe for democracy". Second, the nation was grappling with the influx of immigrants from Asia and Southern and Eastern Europe. Third, America was rapidly pushing her producing and consuming capacity ahead of other nations. The image prevailed that this miracle resulted from the self-reliant individual "pioneering" in a private enterprise system free of government control.

These developments, particularly massive immigration, were reflected in citizen education with an even greater emphasis on patriotic rituals and loyalty to "my country right or wrong." Settlement houses, the press, voluntary organizations and industries turned increasingly to didactic programs designed to "Americanize" immigrants and to elicit signs of loyalty from citizens old and new.And in the schools citizenship programs came under heavy anti-foreign, anti-immigration, anti-pacifist, anti-radical pressures.

Roughly paralleling these trends, however, were other interesting and in the long run more significant developments in citizenship education. First was the movement to make citizenship education a special province of the social studies curriculum. A principal catalyst was the National Education Association's Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education.[4] One effect of this movement was to help shape social studies curriculum patterns essentially still followed today.

Second was a growing concern for "community civics" -- the idea that public affairs nearest to home are most important and a main topic of citizenship education. This notion was advocated by scholars in political science, economics and sociology as well as by the progressively-inspired Municipal League. The movement opened the door for the inclusion of participation and skills in addition to the traditional inculcation of values and civic knowledge as goals of citizenship education.

In the 1930's the Depression, New Deal and rise of totalitarian regimes sparked a social reformist movement in citizenship education. The task of citizenship education was seen as that of preparing individuals and society for collective social planning and government regulation, greater economic interdependence and subordination of private interest to the public welfare. Educators like John Dewey, George S. Counts, William H. Kilpatrick and John Childs produced proposals aimed at guiding curriculum development in citizenship education. But the advent of World War II, economic recovery, and the cold war posed still new challenges.

Into the Present. At the conclusion of World War II the central task of citizenship education came to be seen as that of preparing young people to cope with the political and economic threat of Communism. As McCarthyism became prominent, educators struggled to demonstrate that the schools and the social studies were neither radical nor subversive. Loyalty, the values of democracy and free enterprise, and the need to support one's nation were again emphasized.

During the 1960's formal citizenship education went into decline while informal opportunities for social activism proliferated. Calls for more and better citizenship education were relaxed as McCarthyism waned and the new math, new science and new social studies came to the center of the American educational stage. The new social studies, "took on the patterns of the social science disciplines: cognitive analysis, systematic acquisition of sequential and organized knowledge, conceptual analysis, 'inquiry learning', 'discovery method', and in general a stress upon thinking like a social scientist."[5] In a decade of alienation, assassination, student protest and war, formal citizenship education was seen by many as irrelevant and superficial.

The 1970's have witnessed a resurgence of interest in citizenship education along with a yearning to go "back to the basics" and to limit curriculum experimentation. Yet this revitalized interest in citizenship has inherited from the "new social studies" movement and the social unrest of the sixties a genuine concern for problems of civil rights, women and youth, an interest in teaching about the realities as well as the ideals of the political process and an interest in the development of participation skills.

The importance of citizen participation in a society striving for self-government is well summarized by political scientists Sidney Verba and Norman Nie.

> If democracy is interpreted as rule by the people, then the question of who participates in political decisions becomes the question of the nature of democracy in a society. Where few take part in decisions there is little democracy... Such a definition of democracy...get (s) at the heart of the matter, since all other institutions associated with democracy can be related to the general question of who participates or is able to participate in political life.[6]

CHAPTER I

The Challenge of Citizenship Education Today

Richard C. Remy

CHAPTER I

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZEN EDUCATION

This chapter looks at the task of developing citizen competence. Specifically, we consider seven generalizations about citizenship education in America. These generalizations are addressed to a central question: What kind of educational challenge does the task of citizenship education present today?

This question has implications for the creation of educational policy in this domain. Too often we let the configuration of existing resources dictate how educational problems are defined rather than shaping resources to fit the task as it confronts us. While this is natural, an adequate understanding of citizenship education should inform the commitment of intellectual, monetary, organizational, and material resources in this area. New times may require the combination of familiar resources in new ways as well as the creation of new resources in order to respond adequately to the age-old challenge of citizenship education.

KEY CHARACTERISTICS OF TODAY'S CHALLENGE

Examined from a sociological context and in a historical perspective, several characteristics distinguish the contemporary nature of citizen education. These characteristics are interrelated. Together they form an extensive "definition of the situation," a roadmap or guide to key features in the landscape of citizenship education in contemporary America. We can summarize these characteristics as follows:

1. Citizenship education is complicated by increasing social complexity -- particularly the growth of big government and technological developments.

2. Citizenship education is complicated by the growing interdependence of America with the rest of the world.

3. Citizenship education involves conceptual elaboration of the meaning of citizenship.

4. Citizenship education involves complex processes of human development.

5. Citizenship education is not confined to elementary and high schools.

6. Citizenship education is a continuing challenge for each succeeding generation.

7. Citizenship education in a democracy involves important paradoxes.

THEN AND NOW -- CITIZENSHIP AND SOCIAL COMPLEXITY

America has changed significantly in the last two hundred years. And changes in our society have complicated the task of citizenship education today.

The United States has evolved from a predominantly agricultural society concerned with domestic problems to an urban and industrial society involved in the world economy and politics. We have changed from an emerging, self-confident, largely self-contained society to a nation striving to accommodate its traditional institutions and patterns of thought to conditions new and, in part, unprecedented. We have experienced profound changes in population, social institutions, economy, government, and technology.7 In short, we have become an increasingly complex society.

One aspect of special relevance to citizenship education, is the growth of government at all levels.

In the Presence of Government

The expansion of government in America is most visible at the national level. While the nation's population has multiplied 53 times during the last 185 years, the number of federal government workers has increased about 1,500 times. A year's spending by the federal government in George Washington's first

term would only pay for about seven minutes of federal outlays in our time. Last year federal outlays equaled almost one quarter of the country's total output of goods and services, and involved about 772 million checks.8

The growth of the federal government complicates the task of citizenship education today. It means citizens must deal more often with government at a time when the federal government has become so huge it is almost incomprehensible. The federal government, for example, employs some 2.9 million civilian workers in eleven Cabinet departments, 59 independent agencies, Congress and the federal courts system. One in every 43 Americans draws a federal paycheck.

Further, Washington owns one third of the country's land -- some 760 million acres. It also holds title to over 400,000 buildings and pays about 663 million dollars a year in rent for another 54,000 buildings. This office space houses federal workers administering over a thousand different programs involving more than 4,500 different types of federal forms. The "official records" generated each year could fill eleven Washington Monuments.9

The growth of the federal bureaucracy, however, has not come at the expense of state and local government activity. The role of state and local governments has also expanded in the twentieth century. Political scientist Thomas Dye explains that: "despite the glamour of national politics, states and communities carry on the greatest volume of public business, ...make the majority of policy decisions, and direct the bulk of public programs."10 States and communities in America are responsible for our public school system and highway network. They operate most of the nation's judicial, welfare, police, health, correctional and recreational facilities. And today state and local governments are making an increasing number of decisions about conservation, sanitation, social work, housing, and urban planning vital in our daily lives.

The Complexity of Citizenship Is Increasing

Changes such as the growth of big government have greatly increased the number and complexity of the tasks and responsibilities associated with being a citizen in contemporary America. Today's citizen must possess an ever increasing amount of knowledge and skills just to cope with the demands of daily living.

Decision-Making. Take the case of decision-making, a critically important task faced by citizens across generations. Never before in their role as consumers, for example, have citizens faced such varied and complex issues. Not only must the citizen today decide which auto loan terms are best, for example, but also whether to buy a small car in support of a national energy program in a time of diminishing natural resources, or a large car which better suits family needs. Similarly, today's citizens must not only decide whether to purchase saccharin but also whether the use of saccharin should be limited because of reported cancer risks, and whether there should be a national policy on the issue.

Acquiring Information. How does the citizen acquire information about the political environment and government policies -- again a fundamental skill and responsibility of citizenship. Competence here implies an ability to gather and evaluate relevant data. It further implies an ability to process information efficiently and a capacity to draw reasoned conclusions from that information.

We appear to have an advantage over our predecessors in that we live in an information-rich environment. We are literally inundated by news -- the Vietnam War exploding on television screens, a Watergate presidency crumbling before our eyes, a hijacking drama unfolding as we watch. We are submerged by a flow of information: economic data on the latest move of the consumer price index or the unemployment rate; sociological facts on crime, the divorce rate or smoking habits; opinion polls on politicians or race relations; census reports about population shifts or trends in education.

Yet any advantage this flow of information may provide is more than offset by the complexity of contemporary issues. For the combination of big government and sophisticated technology confront us with an unprecedented array of technological questions dependent on highly specialized information. Should the United States proceed with the development of nuclear power plants or divert resources to solar energy production? Should local governments attempt to restrict recombinant DNA experimentation at local universities and laboratories? What, if anything, can the Environmental Protection Agency and other arms of government do about the depletion of the ozone layer as a result of increasing fluorocarbons in the upper atmosphere? Just what are fluorocarbons and ozone anyway?

Coping with all the information relevant to such issues presents new challenges for citizens. Often, for instance, proponents of one or another public policy present "objective" information which only supports the policy, regulation or legislative action that benefits them. Further, the same information can be and often is introduced to support very different and even contradictory policies. And even in today's information-rich environment, data about complex, technological issues may be incomplete and hard to obtain.

Participation. Finally, the growth of big government and technological complexity seem to have helped spawn new and interesting mechanisms for citizen participation. Electoral politics and traditional organization building have been complemented by "movements," legal actions, consciousness raising, parent groups and tenant and buying groups as means for citizen involvement over issues such as accountability, environmental protection, women's rights and the like.

CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION IN A GLOBAL AGE

The evolution of big government has been accompanied by accelerating global interdependence. This change cuts across all sectors of the human experience and has critical implications for the task of citizenship education. In effect, it means citizenship education must prepare individuals for a future which may differ substantially from the past.

Global interdependence has become an inescapable condition. As Harlan Cleveland points out: "We should recognize that interdependence is not something to be for or against, but a fact to be lived with now and reckoned with in the future."11

Global interrelationships substantially affect the lives of all Americans:

> In recent decades world interdependencies affecting all Americans have gone far beyond hereditary and cultural ties, or traditional diplomatic negotiations and distant military confrontations, and have become operationally immediate. They affect the purity of our air and water; the heat in our homes and office; the price of sugar, coffee, and gasoline; the availability of meat

and fish; the level of taxes, the survival of wildlife; the size of our armed forces; the subject matter of television; the levels of employment and inflation; the tranquility of our spirits; and the image of reality of our future.

Similarly, how America behaves can drastically affect commodity markets in Africa and South America; money markets in London and Zurich; unemployment in Japan and Germany; questions of life and death in the Middle East; budget allocations in China and the Soviet Union; and the stability of regimes in Chile.12

The Impact of Interdependence - A New Citizenship?

Articles in the press, recent scholarly literature, and speeches by public officials indicate a growing awareness of the global dimensions of our society. Yet, we are only beginning to appreciate the impact of this change on our lives as citizens and on the task of citizenship education. At a minimum it means that people now confront the tasks and responsibilities of citizenship in a global or internationalized context. Longshoremen, for example, decide whether or not to load American grain on ships bound for Russia; businessmen and state legislators may encourage investments from foreign firms; and universities must decide whether to spend scarce funds on programs for foreign students.

In addition, the rise of global interdependence may have fundamental implications for our very concept of citizenship. The increasing flow of people, goods and information across national boundaries means that each of us is becoming a participant in a transnational social order as well as a citizen in a nation, state and local community.

When we observe our own daily lives, we quickly become aware of how we are linked to a variety of international processes. In a single day the "typical" American citizen, for instance, may be awakened by a Japanese clock radio, drink morning coffee from Brazil, drive to work in a Fiat on tires made of Malayan rubber, buy Saudi Arabian gas, and listen on a German-made radio to a news report about a visiting Iranian trade delegation.13

Our contact with the rest of the world is not only linked to our lives as consumers. Money we put in a savings account at a local bank is reinvested in an apartment complex in Chile. A donation in our church collection plate helps to build a hospital in Nigeria; modern data processing facilities permit scientists in various countries to rapidly exchange data on biological controls for insects harmful to people. A business investment in a local industry helps produce weapons that kill people in distant lands.

These interdependencies link the individual citizen in relationships extending to all areas of the globe, casting both our conceptions of citizenship and of foreign policy in a new and perhaps unsettling light. It may well be that citizenship in cities, states and nations is not something apart from "global" citizenship. To the contrary, it may be that effective and responsible participation in the world system implies -- indeed demands -- quality citizenship at all other levels of human social organization.

Thus, competent citizenship may require simultaneous attention to responsibilities in the context of many territorial units in addition to the nation-state. It may involve for the first time in human history not only an awareness of physically proximate neighbors but a capacity on the part of all citizens to perceive and understand local/global linkages. It involves an ability to see how one's nation, one's community and one's self are linked to nations, communities and people elsewhere in the world -- a self-conscious awareness of how we affect each other.

Similarly, seen in this light the notion of foreign policy looks quite different. Once thought to be the esoteric business of elites in national capitols, foreign policy formulation becomes a task faced in everyday life by all citizens. For example, there may be some policies regarding global linkages best handled by neighborhoods, while other issues are best handled by cities, and still others by nations or larger supranational units.14 Increasing global interdependence is, therefore, altering the relationship between the average citizen and the processes we have traditionally called "foreign policy."15

It seems clear, then, that the task of citizenship education today is complicated by the fact that America is becoming increasingly interdependent with the rest of the world. Unfortunately, in large measure, citizenship education and "global,

international, world-order, foreign affairs" education in the schools have been mutually isolated from one another. In the past, this state of affairs may have been both natural and tolerable. Today it is neither. If the expanding scope and scale of global interdependence are eradicating the boundaries that once separated foreign and domestic affairs, the same forces are eroding the boundaries that once separated education about American society from education about the rest of the world.

Hence, an important part of the challenge of citizenship education today is to recognize that global education and citizenship education are not mutually exclusive but mutually compatible. It is possible to see examples of the major elements of citizenship in both global and domestic areas. Individuals can, for example, have a sense of loyalty and belonging to a global human community as well as to a national political community; they can support international human rights as well as domestic civil rights; they make, judge and influence decisions in relation to both domestic and global issues.

* * *

Taken together, the first aspects of citizenship education we have considered -- the growth of big government, technological complexity, and global interdependence -- have greatly increased the complexity and scale of the social environment in which we function as citizens. As social complexity increases, the status of what Justice Brandeis called the "office of citizen" also increases in complexity. As the complexity of citizenship increases, the societal tasks of developing citizen competence become more complex and increasingly problematic.

REFINING THE MEANING OF CITIZENSHIP

Another part of the task of citizenship education today is to develop new conceptual models that can guide research, development and service activities in the field. We need to reexamine the meaning of citizenship within a contemporary context.

Citizenship education as an intellectual challenge has a long and distinguished lineage. For Plato and Aristotle, citizenship education was a worthy issue. Plato's Republic, for example, devoted considerable attention to the role of education and childhood experience in the development of civic values. Aristotle concerned himself with "the

type of character appropriate to a constitution." Similarly, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Mill, DeTocqueville and Dewey found the task of developing citizen competence an intellectual challenge calling for the highest quality in human thought.

Yet, during the 1960's and into the 70's citizenship education fell into disfavor among many intellectuals, social scientists and educators. The task of citizenship education was not seen as an intellectual challenge worthy of rigorous conceptual analysis, theory construction, and instructional development. Rather, it came to be viewed by many as an intellectually barren wasteland with few natural resources beyond cliches occasionally useful in political rhetoric.

Prevailing attitudes toward citizenship education are illustrated by the following comments:

> Anything anybody wants to teach can be defended as necessary for 'good citizenship.' James Bryant Conant once insisted that literature should be taught because it promoted citizenship; the Modern Language Association argues that in this age of jet transport foreign languages are needed for citizenship; scientists say that we need citizens informed of the capabilities and limitations of science ... The argument that something should be studied for reasons of 'citizenship', is simply an assertion of self-importance by the proprietors of the subject...As a practical matter 'citizenship' is a hopeless goal for instruction. Any stupidity can be defended as helping to promote it.16

In the last decade and a half, then, some of our best social thinkers seemed to abdicate the field of citizenship education to popular discourse. Often that discourse focused on what one social educator has dubbed the "good scout" view of citizenship. According to this ideal, "the goal of civic education is to produce youth who, male or female, embody virtues such as those listed in the Boy Scout law: 'A Scout is trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean and reverent.'"17

The Consequences of Neglect

The neglect of citizenship education as a worthy intellectual problem, coupled with increasing social complexity, has resulted in a pressing need to develop new conceptualizations for citizenship education. One important conceptual

issue facing citizenship educators today relates to the meaning of citizenship and its proper community referent. Is citizenship an adult activity associated only with governments? Or is citizenship a status for young and old associated with membership in many different social groups such as families, churches, labor unions, schools, and private associations as well as cities, states and nation? What are the implications of the emergence of global interdependence for our concept of citizenship? Are there traditions of citizenship development from other eras which we have forgotten and which might be appropriate to our current situation?

One educator has suggested that:

> "Citizenship in our popular thinking...is intimately linked to a legal status associated with the rise of nation-states. Thus, we tend to define a citizen as a person caught in the acts of voting, obeying laws and loving country. But there are older conceptions of citizenship that antedate the emergence of the nation-state. I suspect that in some of these conceptions there lie keys to liberating our perception of citizenship from the conceptual prisons created by the last four hundred years of western political history. If we begin to rethink the meaning of citizenship within a longer and larger historical context it is intimately and irrevocably linked to our social, biological, and ecological identities as group members, as members of the human species, and as tenants of planet earth."18

Our conception of citizen competence and the educational task of promoting it, is conditioned by our view of the role of citizens. Citizen competence defined solely in terms of a person's relations to governmental institutions implies a particular kind of educational challenge. Citizen competence seen as involving an individual's interaction with the spectrum of his or her social and physical environments contains different implications.

Here are some additional issues worthy of our best efforts in conceptual analysis and elaboration. Readers could expand the list substantially:

- If people learn by experience as well as by books and theory, how can we increase "experience-based" as compared to "book" learning about citizenship?
- How can we provide for a common citizenship preparation while preserving the richness of diversity and pluralism in our complex society?

- How can we stimulate interest and more effective participation in the great variety of governmental and non-governmental institutions which comprise American society?

- How can we better achieve understanding of the basic values associated with citizenship in a democratic society?

To summarize: the task of conceptualization needs to be addressed squarely if we are to make long-term progress in developing citizen competence.

THE PROCESS OF CITIZEN DEVELOPMENT

Citizenship education involves complex processes of human development. The end results of these processes are evident when people confront essential tasks of citizenship in daily life: when the citizen, for instance, faces the task of deciding who to vote for in a mayoral election; when the citizen faces the task of acquiring information about zoning regulations; or when the citizen seeks to influence the decision of a government agency on a particular issue.

Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes and Experiences

Some people are more competent with the tasks and responsibilities of citizenship than others. This is due in part to the fact that they have learned to be so. For people can learn to be more competent with the tasks of citizenship just as they learn to be more or less competent as electricians, teachers, doctors, secretaries or bricklayers. Competence with citizenship tasks involves a multi-dimensional amalgam of knowledge, skills, attitudes and experiences. These attributes are generally identifiable but uniquely configured in each individual. We can briefly illustrate some of these attributes.

Knowledge. In the knowledge domain, competence would seem to require individuals to develop an awareness of the basic values and premises of a democratic society as well as a sound understanding of the operation of formal and informal political processes. We might further expect individuals to have continuing awareness of contemporary issues and problems and the implications of such issues for their daily lives.

Skills. In the area of skills, competent citizenship certainly requires inquiry and intellectual skills such as the ability to acquire reliable information and reason reflectively. Further, we might expect the individual to develop advocacy and participation skills. Among these would be the ability to lead meetings, participate as a discussant, organize and articulate issues, participate in campaigns and the like.

Attitudes. In the attitude domain, identification with the nation and its system of government remains a basic ingredient of citizenship. Facility with specific citizenship tasks involves self-esteem -- a sense of personal identity and self-worth. Self-esteem can enhance the individual's capacity to become a productive and cooperating member of society, and to develop a belief in his or her capacity to influence the environment. Further, a democratic society implies the need for a commitment to procedural attitudes (e.g. free speech) congruent with democratic norms.

Experiences. Finally, those who have had positive experiences practicing various citizenship tasks seem more likely to develop competence than those without such experience. "Learning by doing" as well as by reading and discussion has long been an effective way to master complex skills, acquire practical knowledge and develop a positive self-image. The opportunity for practical experience would seem to be especially important in the development of advocacy and political participation skills.

Our discussion so far clearly indicates the need to move away from a simple view that exposure to a few social studies courses combined with participation in patriotic rituals is sufficient for citizenship development. To the contrary, citizen development is a complex psychological, sociological and political process. This process is part and parcel of the cognitive, moral, social and emotional growth of the human organism. It occurs in the context of the child's, the adolescent's and the adult's encounter with the phenomenological world of daily experience.

Four Key Ideas About Citizen Development

What do we know about this process? Since the early 1960's there has been a veritable explosion of studies on "political socialization" -- the acquisition of politically relevant orientations and patterns of behavior.19 Some of this research is

explored in Chapters II and III. One can draw several ideas about the process of citizen development or political learning (we will use the terms interchangeably) from this research.

Early Learning. The process of citizen development begins early in life. From a young age children are exposed to stimuli, to behavior cues, to events and to a bombardment of information relevant to the political dimensions of human experience. However fragmentary, knowledge is being acquired, skills and attitudes are being shaped, and experience is being gained.

In a sense, children no less than adults are actors and inhabitants within a political world. The political world of children consists of two dimensions. The first involves children's awareness of the larger, adult political world such as perceived attitudes toward governmental authorities, feelings about war, and identification with political parties. In addition, it includes children's fleeting encounters with the physically and psychologically distant world of "adult politics." This includes exposure to "political news" on television; overheard adult conversations about issues such as inflation and elections; explicit instruction by adults (e.g., "good citizens respect the flag," "we are Democrats"); experiences with "political figures" such as policemen; and vicarious adult political experiences acquired in school through simulations, role playing exercises, and identification with political actors portrayed in case studies.

The second dimension of the political world of children consists of the governance of children's everyday life. It occurs through the authority relationships children encounter in the course of their dealings with parents, teachers, other school personnel, peers, older children, and a wide variety of adults in neighborhood and community settings.

For example, in their daily interactions with peers and adults, children learn about leading and following, cooperation and conflict, influence and power, authority and legitimacy, rules and compliance. Rule-making, for example, is found when a group creates a new game on the playground, a teacher formulates a rule about who can operate audio-visual equipment, or a class reaches an agreement about what behavior will not be permitted at its daily meeting. Conflict and its resolution, to take another example, are demonstrated in a playground argument about the rules of a game or in a dispute between teacher and another child. As children mature, the

self develops both emotionally and intellectually, and the relationship of the self to the social environment changes. Hence, as they grow older, children will confront the tasks of citizenship in an increasingly wider variety of political settings. These settings will eventually directly involve governmental institutions and other familiar adult political phenomena, such as elections and political parties.

Continuous Learning. Second, the process of citizen development is cumulative and continuous throughout life. This means that political learning builds on itself to produce the individual's particular way of relating to civic life. What people learn about the social world at one age is influenced by what they have previously learned. For instance, what youngsters learn about elections at age fifteen is grounded in and shaped by what was learned at age twelve. In turn, learning at age twelve is conditioned by earlier learning. This process does not end with high school or college graduation but continues throughout life.

It is likely that we learn different things at different phases in this process. Or to put it another way, because of evolving cognitive/intellectual capacities and opportunities for learning, certain times in our lives will be more suitable to learning particular knowledge, skills and attitudes than other times.

Political scientist Robert Weissberg has advanced three models to explain how our political learning unfolds.20 He suggests early childhood as the time when we acquire basic political attachments and identifications and an initial fund of consensually held factual knowledge. Thus, for example, we learn early that we are American, that democracy and free enterprise are better than communism (understanding of these concepts comes later) and that the United States never initiated a war. Of course, civics courses, the mass media, adult politics and other factors may transform some of these orientations but early learning is a kind of filter which sets broad limits on subsequent learning.

Late childhood and early adolescence are when many of us start to acquire skills relevant to future participation, more specific and accurate factual information about the political environment and general policy preferences, especially partisan

ones. With regard to participation, for example, it is after early childhood that we have real opportunities for taking part in adult political activities such as political campaigning. This is also the time when children begin to develop the mental ability to deal with the processes and concepts associated with political participation. Six year olds will not understand the concept of civil liberties (although they may know freedom is a good thing), but by age thirteen most youngsters have formed opinions about freedom of the press and toleration of dissent.21

Late adolescence and adulthood are the times when we learn about specific issues and actions associated with day-to-day political conflict as well as a time to sharpen political skills and motivations. "Positions on specific current issues, perceptions of candidates for office, strategies of political influence in specific circumstances ... are all choices greatly influenced by events and experiences occurring during adulthood." 22

Several Explanations. A third feature of citizen development is that the process is not adequately explained by any one theory of human learning. We do know that political learning may occur formally -- as when teachers lead their classes in the pledge of allegiance or a leading junior high school textbook asks students to "Write a short research paper on agreements with other nations that the Soviet Union has broken."23 Or political learning may occur informally as when a teenager witnesses a street scene involving a policeman, or a child observes the teacher making an arbitrary decision about which members of the class are eligible for the next field trip.

Two important schools of thought in this area are the cognitive and moral development theories advanced by scholars such as Jean Piaget and Lawrence Kohlberg and the social learning theories advanced by scholars such as Albert Bandura.24

The cognitive developmental approach describes change (i.e., development) as the outcome of the interaction between internal cognitive structures ("schemas") and the external environment. The individual is viewed as an active manipulator of the environment who seeks to reach an equilibrium between his or her internal schemas and the outer world as a result of an intrinsic motivation to resolve conflict. The cognitive-developmental viewpoint proposes the existence of an invariant sequence of stages which individuals must traverse during their development, although they may not necessarily achieve the highest stage.

The social learning viewpoint, mostly identified with the work of Bandura, points out the importance of the environment as a partial but significant determinant of behavior. It is believed that environmental experiences are filtered by internal cognitive mechanisms so that, for example, the same stimuli may elicit different behaviors from two individuals due to the particular way that each individual interprets the experience. Learning is believed to occur through direct reinforcement, modeling, observational learning and vicarious experience.

Each of these approaches to describing, analyzing and understanding how children learn makes its own distinctions, and has its own emphasis. Both approaches have made important contributions to understanding of the process by which citizens learn about politics and hence to the task of citizenship education.

Global Learning. A fourth aspect of citizen development to note is that the process is not confined solely to learning about American national politics.[25] The world into which we have been cast is one in which the political life of humankind is organized into many different types of political systems at different levels of social organization. Much like a cobweb, these systems overlap and interpenetrate but are distinguishable. Just as in the Middle Ages when individuals were subjects of local fiefdoms, larger kingdoms and the Holy Roman Empire, so today individuals are simultaneously members of several overlapping and interpenetrating political systems. The typical American is thus a member of the international political system, the American national political system, and a variety of state and local political systems.

We are exposed to the idea of different and distinguishable levels of politics and government in a variety of ways. In the elementary grades the social studies curriculum is frequently compartmentalized into segments dealing with community helpers and neighborhood life, the political history of the United States, and World geography and history. At the high school level courses on such topics as local or state politics, national government, and world affairs further elaborate the idea that individuals are members of several political systems. Outside of school, for both children and adults, the mass-media regularly "sort" the barrage of stimuli from the political environment into such categories as community affairs, local and state news, national news and world news.

As citizens develop, they acquire political orientations toward the events, institutions and processes within the different political systems to which they belong. Thus, in much the same way as they learn about local, state and national politics, people also learn about international politics. They acquire political attitudes not only toward policemen, the Presidency and the Congress, but also toward the United Nations. Their knowledge of the political world may include not only information about "how a bill became a law" but also about how nations negotiate with each other. Their political values include not only preferences regarding civil rights but also preferences toward war, peace and imperialism.

To summarize: the task of citizenship education involves the understanding that citizen development is a life-long process of human development. This process starts early in life, is cumulative, is not adequately explained by any one theory of human development, is not confined to learning about America and is the result of many forces -- a point we shall now consider in some detail.

SCHOOLS ARE NOT ALONE IN CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Who is responsible for shaping the process of citizen development we have just described? When we think of citizenship education we are likely to think first of the schools. Yet the task of citizenship education is not confined to elementary and high schools. There are many agents or sources of learning in the process of citizen development.

Five Agents of Citizenship Education

In addition to the schools, at least five other agents or sectors of American society are engaged formally or informally in the task of citizenship education. These are governmental institutions, the work place, the mass-media, voluntary affiliations and primary groups (the family and peer group). These sectors of society function both as settings where individuals confront the tasks of citizenship and as sources of the knowledge, skills, attitudes and experiences we acquire in the process of citizen development.

Government. Government institutions at local, state and national levels all engage in citizen education. By their very structure and performance our various governments can shape our orientations and competence.[26] Indeed, an inefficient or inept bureaucracy may "educate" a citizen about government services with considerably more effect than some textbook lessons.

In addition, many government agencies at local, state and national levels (e.g. those involved in consumer protection) have as part of their official mission the task of educating citizens about their area of concern and the services they provide. Further, the Department of Defense and each branch of the armed services carry out extensive education programs on socio/political/military topics for both their own personnel and for the public. As the role of government is expanding into more areas of our life, its role in the process of citizen development is also growing.

Business and Labor. Both private enterprise and the labor movement have a stake in citizenship education. Both strive to educate their own personnel as well as segments of the general public about their position on public issues, such as right-to-work laws or the oil depletion allowance. Further, the business sector has an interest in promoting education about the free enterprise system and works with various public and private agencies to that end. Labor unions, in turn, provide leadership training programs and exercises for their own rank and file. At the same time, organizational structures, mode of governance, and priorities at the work place may also indirectly affect citizen competence or involvement of employees. Both labor and business represent a still largely untapped potential for citizenship education.

Voluntary Affiliations. Many voluntary organizations, and community groups such as the YMCA, scouting programs, ethnic associations and the like have their own educational programs --some directly related to citizenship education. The League of Women Voters, for example, is an important source of information on election candidates and issues for millions of American citizens. In 1976 it was the League of Women Voters which sponsored the historic Presidential and Vice-Presidential debates. Further, voluntary groups may serve as a training ground for sharpening citizenship skills -- particularly those related to advocacy and participation:

> Local dramatic societies, football clubs, churches, political parties and groups, labor union branches, learned societies, mother's unions and towns-women's guilds, chambers of commerce, cooperative societies and consumer groups all have their politics. Their members have to make and administer policy decisions: There is legislative and executive work to be done at however modest a level.[27]

Voluntary organizations also offer a potentially enriching source of learning for those in formal schooling. Professional educators have done little to capitalize on and work with voluntary organizations in developing their own programs. Yet these organizations can often provide schools with speakers and resource persons knowledgeable about a wide range of public issues. In addition, they may offer valuable arenas for student participation in community and civic life.

Mass-Media. The mass-media -- television (public and educational), radio, newspapers, magazines -- are an important and much discussed force in contemporary America. They provide a potentially invaluable means by which the broadest citizenship education can be realized. The most persuasive, most potent and clearly most controversial of these is television. About 99 percent of American households have a television set. Citizens young and old gather factual information about politics and create, change or reinforce their beliefs, attitudes and values by exposure to television programming. Television also presents role models who may prompt viewers to pattern their own thoughts, feelings, or actions after the television personality.[28]

The social and political events and personalities portrayed on commercial television shape and reiterate key values, myths beliefs and theories we hold about our society. In addition, commercial television quickly and widely spreads selected information about political events and issues. And in the absence of competing information, it is difficult for most citizens to dispute what has seemingly occurred before their eyes.

Public and educational television are not as well developed or widespread in this country as commercial television. Yet these forms of television are potentially powerful mediums of instructions.[29] Educational television, for example, can help teachers and learners bridge the gap between the abstractions of formal education and the social reality to which the abstractions can be applied.

When discussing the well-known power of the media in American life, we should also remember some of its limitations. We do know, for example, that the media's greatest persuasive influence seems to occur where attitudes are not deeply held. Where people do have set opinions, they often choose sources of information already congenial to their point of view, and selectively perceive messages according to their outlooks. At the same time the structure of the commercial media, in particular, places pressure on them to avoid controversial areas. Weissburg observes, "To offend large numbers, whether politically, sexually or artistically, is to go broke and most of those controlling the media do not desire bankruptcy."[30] Finally, the sheer number of viewpoints presented by contemporary American media limits its capacity to some extent. We know, for example, that people both choose sources of information already congenial to their point of view and selectively perceive messages according to their outlooks.

Primary Groups. The family and peer groups also play an important role in the task of citizenship education. The very nature of childhood makes the family environment a key influence in the process of citizen development. The family has direct access to the developing citizen. During the very early years this approaches a monopoly. In addition, intense emotional and personal ties are usually forged among members of the same family.[31] Further, our almost total dependence on our parents for basic needs gives us little opportunity for resistance to our parental pressure to conform.[32]

The family contributes to the process of citizen development in several ways.[33] Parents pass on explicitly political orientations to their children through discussion, by modeling behavior and other means. In addition, the family shapes the basic personality, social outlooks and self-concept of the maturing child -- all orientations very relevant to the development of citizen competence. Finally, the family influences the young child's exposure to other agents of citizen development. The friends we have, the schools we attend, the recreational groups we join, etc. are largely determined by the family.

The family's major influence in the citizen development process appears to be in the acquisition of fundamental political outlooks and identification. To summarize the family's role as a shaper of basic citizenship orientations:

> The American home has been a bulwark of political stability by inculcating early loyalty to country and government, acceptance of fundamental political norms, and allegiance to one of the established political parties. Before children enter elementary school, their political orientations are well developed. They are taught at home to differentiate between private and public sectors of life and to recognize that in public matters the higher authority of government must be respected and obeyed.
>
> Through family intra-relationships American children learn a basic orientation to authority which provides a life-long context for political behavior. These family authority patterns tend to generate positive feelings in children toward their immediate home environment, and these positive feelings usually are transferred to the larger world of political affairs.[34]

In addition to family influence, peer groups tend to exert an increasing influence on children. Peer groups, which comprise members sharing relatively equal status as well as close ties,[35] assume a growing importance during adolescence. Such groups may stress values which conflict with parental views, and in matters of immediate personal importance may exert more influence than parents.

Peer relationships continue to be part of the process of citizen development throughout life. As we mature, their form changes to include marriage (husband-wife pairs), work and professional colleagues, neighbors and relations developed among people in social and religious organizations. Such peer groups are sources of political information and ideas throughout life. They can be an important impetus for changing the basic political outlooks we develop early in family life.

The Role of Schools

We have seen that government, business and labor, voluntary affiliations, the mass-media, and primary groups all contribute to the process of citizen development. What of the schools? By historical tradition and legal mandate, elementary and high schools in the United States have been charged with a special responsibility for citizen education. Regardless of how well or how poorly this official mission has been carried out, and regardless of ambiguities surrounding terms like "civic education", this prime commitment has been a fact of American poli-

tical life since the early days of the Republic. Writing before the turn of the Century, Horace Mann expressed this historic concern when he stated that the traits associated with self-government "cannot be born and matured in a day; and if school children are not trained to it, we only prepare ourselves for disappointment."[36]

R. Freeman Butts recently put it this way:

> The prime purpose of the public schools is to cultivate the political virtues that are appropriate to constitutional self-government and that are required to achieve a society which stands for justice, equality, and freedom in the modern world ... Just how to do this is the next order of business for American public education...Somehow the sentiments of civic morality as well as the knowledge required for informed public judgment and responsible political action must be promoted by the schools.[37]

It has been fashionable in recent years to chastise the schools for their "failure" or "poor job" in the area of citizenship education as well as in other areas. And social science research and current events indicate that for too many Americans citizenship education in school does indeed remain inadequate. On the other hand, in recent years many efforts have been made to upgrade the quality of citizenship education in our schools--some with notable effect. As we shall see, our society is approaching the point where the schools have reached the limits of their capacity to contribute to the task of citizenship education. The responsibility of other agencies of citizen development must be more fully recognized in the process of developing competent citizens.

Unique Characteristics of Schools. Schools have always been an important part of citizenship education because they have a great opportunity to influence the minds of the young. What characteristics of schools as social institutions in contemporary America enable them (potentially at least) to take advantage of this opportunity?

First, whether they be small or large, urban or rural, "free" or highly structured, elementary and high schools are potentially "information-rich" environments regarding knowledge about political life. Through the formal social studies curriculum as well as teacher expertise, schools are supposed to contain the organized bodies of knowledge and analytical

"tools" needed to help students better understand political life. Just as we do not expect the mass-media or peer groups to teach fundamental concepts of physics, chemistry or mathematics, the best chance for systematic teaching of fundamental concepts of political life is probably in the schools.

Second, schools provide a protective environment for the controlled integration of political knowledge and political experience. Further, schools offer a continuity of experience over time, and a range of politically relevant behavior settings (e.g. extracurricular clubs) in which students can observe and participate. Schools are, therefore, learning environments where students can self-consciously develop and practice citizenship skills, and experiment with alternative modes of civic behaviors. In the school the student's practice and experimentation can be undertaken in controlled instructional settings which maximize the opportunity for self-conscious reflection on the part of the student and for integration with knowledge-building activities underway in the classroom.

Third, schools constitute environments which contain a large number of adults who occupy very salient places in the lives of students, particularly at the elementary level. Political learning can and does result from the imitation of others' behavior. Whether they wish to or not, school personnel serve as important models of political behavior for children. Teachers, the principal, counselors, office clerks, building engineers and other adults associated with the daily life of the school interact with students on a regular basis. These adults represent important, immediately relevant authority figures who -- for several hours a day, five days a week, 40 weeks a year -- in one way or another directly influence an important segment of the student's social life. From observation of and interaction with these adults, students may acquire a wide range of political behaviors. On any ordinary day in a school, for example, students are likely to observe the exercise of authority, rule-enforcement, diverse attempts at interpersonal influence and so on.

Parenthetically, we might add that local schools have one attribute indirectly related to the political learning of children. As a community institution, local schools provide a readily accessible arena for civic activity by adults. Parents and others can and often do participate in various school related elections, in PTA-type organizations, on school boards and in

other school affiliated organizations. Parents may seek to influence school policy decisions and they often make judgments about school management and policy. Such activity can affect parent-child relations in ways important to the child's political development. For example, by serving as an officer in a PTA-type organization a parent is modeling civic activity and involvement for his or her offspring. Similarly, by taking part in a demonstration aimed at changing a school policy parents may be teaching their children about methods of influence available to citizens.

The Problems of Curriculum Overload

In spite of their potential, American schools are on the verge of a curriculum crisis. One of the single most distinctive features of schools today is the fact that their organizational agenda is very crowded. Over the years classes in such areas as science, language arts, social studies, music, physical education, drama, and art have taken their place in the curriculum with the "basics" of reading, writing and arithmetic.

The crowded nature of the school agenda reflects the fact that in the scope and range of their responsibilities schools are among the most burdened institutions in American society. Not only are they expected to teach students basic skills in reading, writing and mathematics, but we also expect them to promote students' physical and emotional health. In addition, parents want schools to foster the growth of whatever talents their children may have in such areas as music, art, dance, and sports. Students want their schools to be places full of fun and joy. And an increasingly technological society demands that schools provide the basic training for tomorrow's scientists and engineers.

One social analyst explains that the curriculum crisis has arisen

> "...as schools undertake more and more of the social functions previously allotted to other institutions (the home, the church, the Boy and Girl Scouts, etc). In part this crisis results from the expansionist tendency of any institutional bureaucracy; and in part derives from the fact that the public casually assigns to the schools the social functions it no longer wishes to undertake. But within the school it is often not clear how to embody these new functions in a teachable curriculum, and each new function takes its toll in time and money. The underlying problem seems to be that there is not consensus about the legitimate functions of school, and therefore no agreement about which of many competing interests have the authority to make any choices."[38]

Curriculum overload seems particularly acute in social studies education. Global education, multi-cultural education, career education, consumer education, environmental education, values education, psychology, sociology, and economics now compete with the more traditional history, geography and government for a share of the social studies curriculum "turf." And within the field of civic education one author has distinguished eight distinct approaches: the academic disciplines of history and the social sciences, law related education, social problems, critical thinking, values clarification, moral development community involvement and institutional school reform.[39] While not mutually exclusive, these approaches represent different points of view and are promoted in ways which emphasize distinctions between each approach while at the same time affirming a common purpose in civic education.

Many such approaches were originally developed to remedy one or another perceived weakness in the school curriculum. For instance, one major impetus behind law-related education has been the perception on the part of organizations like the American Bar Association that existing curriculum did not adequately equip students with knowledge and skills related to American legal processes.

The net effect of this, however, is an interest-group approach to curriculum change in which either there is room for law-focused education, for instance, or there is room for one or more of its competitors -- but there is not room for all. A Resource Guide for English and Social Studies illustrates the heights or depths to which the problem can go. The Guide announces that:

> In the 10th grade, study is concentrated on the growth of democracy, and especially on the form of government which developed. Such a study should be brief and to the point in order to allow time for the unit on Driver Education.[40]

As various "interest groups" compete for space in the curriculum, it is clear that some are destined for rejection. Decisions on such matters are made as often in response to political and monetary pressures as in response to societal or student needs.

A natural outgrowth of the interest group approach is the mustering of political support and resources necessary to convince skeptical publishers, school administrators, teachers and others of the validity of the interest being pushed. Great amounts of intellectual talent, and psychological and physical energy are often expended on such support building activities. The students' education meanwhile, becomes increasingly fragmented and often bears little relationship to the actual tasks and responsibilities of citizenship.[41]

Agents in Perspective

Each sector we have considered -- the school, government, work, voluntary organizations, mass-media, primary groups -- represents a particular point of access to the process of citizen development. Three things should be kept in mind when considering this spectrum of educational agents or arenas.

First, as we have seen, it is likely we learn different things from different sources at different points in our life-cycle as citizens. Thus, for example, a 45 year old surgeon is not likely to have learned the details of federal policy on national health insurance from her parents. At the same time, she may have acquired certain attitudes toward the role of "big government" in the health care field from her parents at an early age. Her propensity to participate or "get involved" in influencing government policy along with the skills to do so may have started developing during her high school years as senior class president and as a student in several social studies courses. And it may have been a report from the American Medical Association that prompted her to write her senator about health care legislation.

Second, certain sectors are more appropriate for teaching certain kinds of knowledge, skills, and attitudes or providing particular experiences than other sectors. Thus, schools, for instance, are more likely to be an efficient vehicle for teaching facts about constitutional processes than are families and peer groups. Whereas research indicates that families and peer groups can be strong forces in shaping basic identities, values and skills, the mass-media may be an important source of information and opinions about current events.

Third, different sectors may be more or less susceptible to planned interventions in the process of citizen development. Put another way, educational policy-makers should consider which sectors constitute the most efficient routes of access to the citizen development process.[42]

The family serves as an example. In spite of the importance of its role, the family may be the agent of citizen development least susceptible to direct intervention. For one thing, the sheer number of families presents a tremendous communication problem. A message about citizen development would have to be communicated to millions of families with a variety of ideas about child rearing. Nor could one assume that because a message was communicated to parents it would be absorbed. In our recent history there is perhaps only one illustration of a single source significantly influencing child-rearing practices -- Dr. Spock, through his widely read Baby and Child Care.[43] As with the family, schools, the mass-media, voluntary organizations, government and work, each offer their advantages and disadvantages in terms of planned intervention.

Clearly, the issues here are very complex. Unfortunately, we are not able to identify precisely which sectors are the most appropriate carriers of which particular interventions in citizenship education at what point in the individual's life-cycle. Nor, as we have seen, do we have conceptualizations of citizenship and the process of citizen development sufficiently powerful to guide the development of such typologies.

* * *

To summarize, we have attempted to show that the task of citizenship education is not confined to what happens in elementary and high schools. Government, the mass-media, voluntary organizations, work and primary groups are interdependent elements in an ongoing educational process that constitutes a learning community. Each sector is an important arena of civic activity that participates in the citizen development process in its own way. Hence, the task of citizenship education is not an academic enterprise of interest only to professional educators, but is rather a collaborative activity for the schools and other sectors of society.

CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION AS A CONTINUING CHALLENGE

Americans are problem-solvers. We like to take on and resolve specific, clear-cut challenges -- such as putting a man on the moon within a decade. Hence, it is important to recognize that the challenge of citizenship education is a continuing challenge for each suceeding generation, not an "issue" somehow to be resolved once and for all. As societal conditions change, various facets of citizenship education will also change but the basic challenge will remain. Each generation of Americans must redefine the meaning of the term 'good citizen' for itself drawing on the past for wisdom, on the present for challenge, and on the future for promise.[44]

What Next?

Our brief discussion of citizenship today indicates that as American society has "matured," the task of citizenship education has continued to take on new dimensions. Citizenship education has evolved to include not only value inculcation aimed at national cohesion but also the development of an array of knowledge, skills and experiences. Further, citizenship education is becoming more sophististicated as educators come to learn more about the social and psychological dynamics involved in the process of citizen development.

What next? There are certainly as many "answers" as there are social commentators. Yet it seems clear that the ever-increasing technological complexity of our society coupled with the continued growth of big government will shape the task of citizenship education. Similarly, changes in the international system and in America's place in the world will bear directly on the educational future. The limits of growth are being reached as planetary wear and tear increases.

Clearly one central challenge will be to devise ways to help citizenship education better transcend formal schooling. For as we have seen, the schools are fast reaching their capacity to contribute to the task of citizenship education. Many agencies of society take part in the process of citizen development. The constructive involvement of these agencies will have to be expanded and at the same time better coordinated with continually improving efforts in school-based citizenship education.

> . . . we must begin to think of education between 1976-2001 as transcending schooling. In the next 25 years and beyond, educational agencies (including the mass-media) must more fully share with the schools the burden of continually educating millions of adult Americans.[45]

PARADOXES IN CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

It seems appropriate to conclude by noting two paradoxes identified by John Patrick as inherent in the task of citizenship education in a democracy.[46] The first derives from the potential contradiction between teaching belief in a fixed constellation of values (the principles of American democracy) and teaching skills associated with independent, evaluative thinking. The second involves the tension between acceptable and effective political participation.

Values and Independent Thinking

Recall that prior to the late 1920's, citizenship education was designed to foster national cohesion and a particular image of American democracy. Concern for critical thinking and student inquiry did not start to become a part of citizenship education until the 1930's. Today, in theory at least, both these goals -- inculcation of democratic principles and independent thinking -- have become an accepted part of citizenship education.

Teaching democratic values is seen as essential to the preservation of our political system and way of life. Teaching critical thinking skills is seen as essential to helping citizens master new problems that will surely arise in each generation. Such skills can help citizens to exercise independent judgment, develop their own solutions and gain freedom from the automatic reactions of the crowd.

And thus arises the first paradox. Simply, are these two facets of citizenship education really compatible? For, as John Dewey observed: "If we once start thinking no one can guarantee what will be the outcome except that many objects, ends, and institutions will be surely doomed."[47]

Is it likely that skilled, independent thinkers may challenge the appropriateness of our democratic principles in certain situations, places and times? By educating citizens to be independent thinkers, we give them the "tools" to change the very economic and political system which is our tradition.[48] At the least, a lasting tension exists between the forces of change and reconstruction. At the other end, critical thinking may lead to social upheaval and fundamental change. Ernest Becker presents this dilemma:

> If we free them, (youth) they may threaten the whole state of our society -- which is the State itself. By the inexorable logic of things, then, the State must oppose full freedom of education. The full tragedy of the paradox is that this is the only way that the State, as it now stands, can be saved; but in order for the State, as it now stands, to be saved, it must consent to give itself freely over to be changed. A bitter problem, that is rooted at the very core of the human condition: the very thing that man fears most, is the thing he most needs: the unexpected repercussions of the free creative energies of his fellow.[49]

Acceptable and Effective Participation

The second paradox centers around the limits of acceptable citizen participation. Since the 1920's educating citizens for responsible and effective participation has been a prominent feature of practically every statement of goals in citizenship education. Good citizens are supposed to take part in the life of their society.

At the same time responsible participation has generally come to mean participation acceptable to the majority of citizens or to political leaders acting as representatives of the majority. And herein lies a paradox. Effective participation in a given situation may require violation of generally held norms for acceptable citizen action. For example, many citizens who sought to influence national government policy on the Vietnam War engaged in forms of political participation deemed quite unacceptable by many other citizens and political leaders. And civil rights activists crossed the limits of acceptable citizen participation in the South during the 1960's.

Citizenship education which teaches skills for effective participation can result in behavior which threatens cherished American values and ways of doing things. Some citizens may use their skills in ways which threaten fundamental tenets of the majority. Is it legitimate to wonder can we afford to risk this kind of outcome? Can we afford to avoid the risk?[50]

Educators had responded to these paradoxes in a variety of ways. Some have ignored them by downplaying critical thinking and participation in favor of the uncritical transmission of selected beliefs and information. Others have avoided the issue by positing the real goal of citizenship education as learning how to learn about political life. Social reconstructionists during the 1930's and 1960's sidestepped both paradoxes by defining the purpose of citizenship education as the promotion of their own particular vision of the "good" social order.

We offer no "solution." Nor is one necessary. But we must recognize that such paradoxes are an inherent part of the task of citizenship education and we must be willing to live with the risks associated with giving our people the best, most honest citizenship education possible.

SUMMARY

The education of competent citizens is a continuing challenge for American society. The challenge is conditioned today by the growing social and technological complexity of our society as well as America's increasing interdependence with the rest of the world.

Being a competent citizen in contemporary America involves a complex amalgam of knowledge, skills, attitudes and experiences. These are acquired through a life-long process of human development. Schools play an important role in this process but are not the only agent of citizen education. Governments, business and labor, voluntary organizations, the mass-media and primary groups contribute directly and indirectly to the development of citizens.

The task of citizenship education in a democracy involves paradoxes. Can such education instill orientations supportive of American democracy and also teach critical thinking skills? Can such education teach participation skills which are both effective and acceptable to the majority of citizens and their representatives in government?

Education for good citizenship is a critical goal for America today. But we must always remember that the means we use to achieve that goal are as important as the democratic ends we strive for. These means should be open, visible, and accessible. They should create independence rather than dependence in those involved. They should help people learn how to cope more adequately with their own local agendas and problems. The alternative is problem-solving and decision making by bureaucratic fiat or power/elite dominance. Hence, the task of citizenship education entails the creation of problem-solving processes that over a period of time will involve citizens in cycles of increasing awareness, evaluation, and self conscious efforts to control their own destiny.

FOOTNOTES

1. The historical discussion in this section draws heavily upon the work of R. Freeman Butts, especially his paper, "Historical Perspective on Civic Education in the United States," mimeographed, February 1976.

2. Walter D. Talbot, "Education for Citizenship," A paper delivered at the Annual Convention of the Council of Chief State School Officers, November 1974, p.2.

3. Butts, op. cit., p.18.

4. National Education Association, Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, U.S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin #35, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1918, p. 14.

5. Butts, op. cit., p. 38.

6. Sidney Verba and Norman Nie, Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality, New York: Harper and Row, 1972, p. 1. Verba and Nie define participation in terms of attempts to influence government decisions. In this report our conception of participation is broader and includes citizen involvement in a wide range of social and political activities.

7. Henry Steele Commager, The American Mind, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952, p. 41.

8. U.S. News and World Report, August 16, 1976, p. 22.

9. Ibid., p. 22. See also U.S. News and World Report, November 4, 1974, p. 38.

10. Thomas R. Dye, Politics in States and Communities, 3rd. ed., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1977, pp. 12-13.

11. Harlan Cleveland, "Our Coming Foreign Policy Crisis," Saturday Review, September 6, 1975.

12. Stephen K. Bailey, International Education and Cultural Exchange, Vol. XI, Fall 1975, p. 5.

13. Chadwick F. Alger, "Increasing Opportunities for Effective and Responsible Transnational Participation, Mershon Center Quarterly Report, 1:4, Summer 1976, p. 2.

14. Chadwick F. Alger, "'Foreign Policies' of United States Publics," Mershon Center, Ohio State University Informal Publication Series, 1975, p. 58.

15. Ibid.

16. Martin Mayer, Where, When and Why: Social Studies in American Schools, New York: Harper and Row, 1962, pp.96-99.

17. Fred Newmann, "Building a Rationale for Civic Education," Paper presented at an invitational conference of the National Council for the Social Studies, Indianapolis, March 1976 (revised February 1977).

18. Anderson, op. cit., p. 166.

19. For an introduction to this research see Richard E. Dawson, Kenneth Prewitt and Karen S. Dawson, Political Socialization, (2nd edition) Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1977.

20. Robert Weissberg, Political Learning, Political Choice and Democratic Citizenship, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974, pp. 23-31.

21. Ibid., pp. 28-29.

22. Ibid., p. 29.

23. Quoted in Byron G. Massialas, "We Are The Greatest!" in Social Studies in the United States, edited by C. Benjamin Cox and B. Massialas, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1967, p. 183.

24. For an introduction to the work of these scholars see Albert Bandura, Social Learning Theory, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1977) and Barry J. Wadsworth, Piaget's Theory of Cognitive Development, New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1971.

25. Richard C. Remy, et.al., International Learning and International Education in a Global Age, Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies, Bulletin 47, 1975.

26. Roberta S. Sigel- Learning about Politics: A Reader in Political Socialization, New York: Random House, 1970, p. 491.

27. Harold Entwistle, Political Education in a Democracy, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971, p. 78.

28. Albert Bandura, "Social Learning Theory of Identification Processes," in D.A. Goslin (Ed.) Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1971, p. 214.

29. See, for example, John J. Patrick and Richard C. Remy, "Essential Learning Skills in the Education of Citizens," Background Paper, Agency for Instructional Television, Bloomington, Indiana, 1977.

30. Weissberg, op. cit., p. 170.

31. Dawson, et. al., op. cit., pp. 114-115.

32. James C. Davies, "The Family's Role in Political Socialization," The Annals 361 (1965).

33. Ibid., pp. 116-118.

34. John J. Patrick, Political Socialization of American Youth, Research Bulletin No. 3, Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies, 1967, p. 19.

35. Dawson, et. al., op. cit., p. 183. The discussion of peer groups is drawn largely from Dawson, et. al., pp. 184-185.

36. Quoted in Byron G. Massialas, Education and the Political System, Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969, p. 2.

37. R. Freeman Butts, Education Summary, February 1, 1974, p. 5.

38. Quoted in Willis W. Harman , "'Seis-ing' Up the Social Revolution," Phi Delta Kappan, 58:1 (September 1976), p. 132.

39. Newmann, op. cit., p. 6.

40. Robert Hutchins, Boston Globe, February 16, 1976.

41. The interest group approach to curriculum reform is not totally improper. Much can be said in favor of having advocates lobby for space in the curriculum. It can be argued, for example, that such competition forces proponents of various curricular offerings to sharpen their thinking and to fully justify their case.

42. This discussion is drawn from Weissberg, op. cit., pp. 140-148

43. Weissberg, op. cit., p. 144.

44. Daniel Roselle, "Citizenship Goals For A New Age," Social Education, 30, 1966, p. 415.

45. Harold G. Shane, "America's Next 25 Years: Some Implications for Education," Phi Delta Kappan 58:1, September 1976, p. 80.

46. This section is based on ideas presented by John J. Patrick, "Goals in Political Education," A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 1977, pp. 1-9.

47. John Dewey, Characters and Events, p. XI, Quoted in Patricia C. Sexton, The American School: A Sociological Analysis, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967, p. 81.

48. Patrick, op. cit., pp. 5-6.

49. Ernest Becker, Beyond Alienation, New York: George Braziller, 1967, p. 38-39.

50. Patrick, op. cit., pp. 5-6.

CHAPTER II

THE STATUS OF CITIZEN EDUCATION

Howard Mehlinger and John J. Patrick

CHAPTER II

INTRODUCTION

Any effort to improve citizen education in the United States must include an assessment of its current strengths and weaknesses and a review of the programs on which it depends. Without such an assessment it is impossible to know what reforms are most needed. Without a review of citizen education programs, it is difficult for reformers to avoid duplication and redundancy. While the information which follows is in no sense a comprehensive review of citizen education activities, it does attempt to illustrate the major parameters of the field in order to stimulate thought about citizen education as a whole.

This chapter is organized according to the four essential attributes of an effective citizen as presented in Chapter One: knowledge, skills, attitude, and participation experience. Within each section the reader is first introduced to important findings regarding the current level of citizen performance in a domain--and to a lesser degree the principal sources that affect citizen achievement. Next, illustrative programs designed to promote citizen knowledge, skills, attitudes, or participation are described. Placement within each category is to some extent arbitrary. Most programs involve some combination of all four attributes, but they have been assigned to a particular category based on what appears to be their major program emphasis. It should also be understood that the illustrative programs do not imply endorsement. They were selected because they tap the wide range and variety of citizen education programs that exist today. In the absence of evaluative data it would be foolish to recommend one set of activities over another. Equally innovative and interesting programs were omitted because of lack of space.

The illustrative programs are grouped according to various "sectors" of society -- i.e., schools, media, government, family, religious organizations, labor, business, etc. Grouping programs under these sectors signals once again that citizen education is not the exclusive responsibility of any single social institution, such as the family or school. Citizen education is a life-long process which requires continuous positive contributions from many sources.

More is known and more programs exist concerning the level of citizen knowledge than about citizen skills, attitudes, or participation opportunities. Therefore, the treatment that follows gives less than equal space to each of these four elements because there is more information about some than about others.

KNOWLEDGE ASSOCIATED WITH EFFECTIVE CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Effective citizens have certain kinds of knowledge which enable them to make a difference in public affairs, to achieve significant goals. Citizens who can participate effectively have knowledge of the organization and function of basic economic and political principles, at least at a simple, general level of comprehension. They know major historical developments which have shaped the contours of the current socio-cultural scene.

Effective citizens are also aware of the increasing interdependence of governments and peoples around the world. They have accurate information and conceptions of other ways of life and of the interactions of our government and people with the rest of the world.

Citizens must be knowledgeable to perform essential tasks of citizenship, such as making, judging, influencing, and implementing decisions. Competent performance of these essential tasks is necessary to the achievement of a responsive government.

The Status of Citizen Knowledge

To what extent do Americans have the knowledge necessary for competent performance of essential tasks of citizenship? Various recent studies provide evidence on which to base supportable generalizations about citizens' political knowledge, economic literacy, historical understanding, and international understanding.

Political Knowledge

Despite the potential for utilizing political knowledge functionally as adults, studies of adult knowledge from the 1940's to the 1970's provide ample evidence of the long-standing political ignorance of large numbers of adult citizens.[1] After reviewing numerous surveys of the political knowledge of adults, one researcher concluded that "these data are sufficient to establish that a large proportion of the American public cannot, or recently could not, intelligently vote or participate in the democratic process.[2]

We can trace through studies of school-age groups, the acquisition of some basic political knowledge. Pre-adolescents (7th and 8th graders) are aware of politics and government.[3] They tend to have a general sense of the need to maintain order and social stability.[4] They also tend to express basic misconceptions and ignorance of political processes.

For instance they tend: (1) to have an exaggerated belief in the power of an individual to influence public policy; (2) to over estimate the utility of voting as a means to influence government; (3) to overlook the value of orderly conflict and competition as a fundamental facet of our political processes; and (4) to be ignorant of how to influence public policy decisions.[5]

Most pre-adolescents and older adolescents have knowledge of prominent features of governmental institutions. This knowledge increases with age. For example, the national performance level of 13-year-olds on a 34-item test of political knowledge was 62%. The level for 17-year-olds responding to the same test was 71%.[6] By the time they graduate from high school, most adolescents know such information about government as the following: (1) the power of public officials is limited by law: (2) certain officials are elected to office while others are appointed; (3) Congress includes two houses; (4) responsibilities for providing different public services are shared by local, state, and federal governments; (5) the Constitution includes provisions to protect the rights and freedoms of individuals. Both pre-adolescents and older adolescents indicate a high level of knowledge about criminal rights.[7]

However, both younger and older students are ignorant of important facets of government and politics. They tend to be unable to name their Senators, Congressional representatives or governor. About half of the 17-year-old respondents and almost three-fourths of the 13-year-olds did not know that each state has two Senators in the U.S. Senate. About the same proportions of these two groups did not know that the number of Congressmen from each state in the U.S. House of Representatives varies with the population of the state. About half of each age group believed that the President has power to appoint representatives to Congress. Very few respondents knew what powers Congress has to block a President who sends armed forces to fight a war without Congressional approval.[8]

High school students tend to lack knowledge of socio-cultural forces associated with political behavior. They tend to be ignorant of the relationship of the social class system to differences in influence and power of different groups of citizens. They tend to be ignorant of the processes of governance in important groups such as the U.S. Congress or city councils.[9]

A recent survey by Louis Harris and Associates shows that today's adult citizens have about the same low level of political knowledge as today's adolescents and the adult citizens of the past.[10]

Less than 40% of a nationally representative sample of adults claim to be well-informed about government or current political events. Less than half of the respondents could name both of their Senators or the Representative to Congress from their district. Less than two-thirds knew that Congress is comprised of the House of Representatives and U.S. Senate. Twenty percent said Congress consists of the House, the Senate, and U.S. Supreme Court -- this after all the textbook preachments about the three branches of government. Louis Harris concluded that "these results indicate substantial gaps in the public's knowledge of both the structure of government and also of many of the key individuals elected to high office.[11]

Economic Literacy

Economic literacy refers to the ability of citizens to deal competently with the economic aspects of public issues and with the economic aspects of decisions in their daily lives. Studies conducted during the past 30 years by the Joint Council on Economic Education have documented the public's lack of economic literacy.

A survey of about 20,000 secondary school students found that most were ignorant of fundamental principles of our economic system. For example: "most did not know that the U.S. economy is based on a free-enterprise system."[13] A test of economic understanding was administered to about 13,000 students in the 7th, 8th, and 9th grades in 22 sample school systems across the country. The test items required respondents to recall and use important facts about the economic system of our country. A majority of respondents answered less than half of the test items correctly.[14]

The findings of the Joint Council's surveys indicate a serious lack of economic understanding among adolescents. Dr. Glenn S. Dumke, Chancellor of California's State University and Colleges, interpreted these findings as follows: "On public questions involving economic issues, our schools and our universities in many ways fail to prepare the great majority of students to make wise decisions.[15]

Studies of adult economic literacy show similar results. For example, 90% of a sample of wage earners did not understand the relationship of productivity to their standard of living.[16] Another survey of adults found that the average citizen thought that profits amount to about 28 cents out of each sales dollar. Walker concluded after a review of various surveys of economic literacy, that "survey after survey turns up evidence of the distorted and incorrect views that many Americans have about our economic system."[17]

Historical Understanding

The best indicator of citizen's historical knowledge is provided by two New York Times surveys, one in 1943 and the other in 1976. In 1943, the New York Times, in association with eminent American historians, tested 7,000 college freshmen on their knowledge of U.S. history. They found "striking ignorance of even the most elementary aspects."[18] A similar survey was conducted in 1976. This time the respondents were 1,856 freshmen enrolled in 194 colleges systematically selected to be a nationally representative sample. The results were similar to the 1943 survey.[19]

Overall, students achieved an average score of 56% on knowledge recall questions and 42% on items requiring conceptual understanding and analysis. One interpreter of the findings concluded: "College freshmen know as much American history overall as did their counterparts 33 years ago..."[20] Another interpreter concluded: "The survey contradicts the widely held view of young Americans as profoundly ignorant of their country's past, but it discloses that they lack the kind of detailed information that historians say they must have to understand either the past or the present."[20]

Respondents showed a general comprehension of American history. However, they lacked knowledge of details and understanding of historical events. For example, respondents were aware of the Bill of Rights and recognized the Louisiana Purchase. However, two-thirds "had a fundamental misconception about the orgins of religious toleration and the nature of Reconstruction."[22]

"The main conclusion one must draw" said Professor William Leuchtenburg of Columbia University: "is that this group of students know remarkably little American history. Two-thirds do not have the foggiest notion of Jacksonian democracy. Less then half even know that Woodrow Wilson was President during World War I."[23]

The significance of the New York Times survey for citizen education is most striking when one considers that the respondents are representative of a small elite group -- college freshmen. It seems likely that more typical citizens would have scored much lower on the New York Times test. In general, our people seem to lack the understanding of history necessary for the competent performance of essential citizenship tasks.

Global Understanding

Both younger and older students tend to lack information about other peoples and places around the world and to lack understanding of the relationship between the United States and other nation-states. They also tend to express misconceptions of the ways of various peoples.[24] In particular knowledge of the peoples and nation-states of Africa and Asia is limited. One study concludes that students learn incorrect information and distorted conceptions of Africa rather than simply learning nothing.[25]

Even after three wars conducted in that geographic area, research has revealed extensive ignorance of politics in Asia and of the involvement of the United States in this part of the world. Researcher Don D. Smith concluded that surveys conducted during the past two generations reveal a continuing ignorance of foreign affairs among the general public.[26] In comparison with other nations, the global understanding of Americans is poor. A survey of 14-year-olds in eight countries showed that although Americans ranked second in their knowledge of domestic political processes and institutions, their ranking with respect to knowledge of international processes and institutions was seventh out of eight.[27]

In addition, children, adolescents, and adults tend to have scant awareness of the increasing interdependence of various governments and peoples around the world.[28] As discussed in Chapter One, the world today is one of continued and far-reaching interactions between the decisions and actions of different governments, business, cultural institutions, and consumers in various countries. Yet all of our citizens tend to remain ignorant of increasing global interdependence.

This review of surveys about citizen knowledge reveals serious shortcomings. Large numbers of citizens do not have the knowledge needed to make competent decisions about public issues or to participate effectively in various political arenas.

Social Bases of Citizen Knowledge

The family, school, and mass media are three significant forces in citizen knowledge. The family initiates learning about civic affairs in the development of young citizens. Two conditions account for the importance of the home as a source of civic education. First, family life, although changing in structure, is pervasive in our society. Second, in most cases, family ties are stronger than other social relationships of the developing citizen. Indeed, the American home has been a bulwark of political stability by inculcating early loyalty to country and government, and acceptance of fundamental civic norms.[29]

The family also influences the young citizen's exposure to other sources of civic education. A study which describes the significance of family status, or position in society, in the development of young citizens states:

> The friends one has, the schools one attends, and the religious and recreational groups one participates in during childhood and youth are determined in large part by the geographic and social position provided by the family . . . In this way the family has a lasting impact on its offspring.[30]

Surveys of political knowledge, economic literacy, historical understanding, and global understanding reveal relationships between family status and test performance. For example, respondents from lower socio-economic status families are more likely to have low scores on these tests. There is a direct relationship between membership in a family with higher socio-economic status and having more knowledge associated with effective citizen action.[31]

White respondents are more likely to achieve high scores in these knowledge surveys than are blacks. However, socio-economic status rather than race is the dominant factor as blacks from upper socio-economic status families tend to do about as well as whites from upper status homes.

The school, whose distinctive mission is to impart knowledge, is perhaps the most important source of knowledge for a citizen. Formal education in history, civics, government, and economics, is supposed to be designed to teach knowledge needed by citizens in our society. Indeed, education for good citizenship in a democratic society has been the dominant goal of social studies education in American schools.[32]

The knowledge needed to perform citizenship tasks competently varies with exposure to formal education. The higher one's educational attainment, the more likely one is to have a higher level of knowledge.[33]

The school's significance as a prime source of citizen knowledge focuses our attention on this institution in viewing the shortcomings cited in this domain. Numerous critical reviews of textbooks in history, economics, civics, and government have highlighted major flaws in content. A recent appraisal of economics content in high school texts was sponsored by the Joint Council on Economic Education. The researchers concluded that in general the books "are unlikely to assist a student either to identify an economic problem or to use economic analytical processes."[34] They found numerous errors of fact, out-of-date interpretations, and inadequate explanations and misapplication of economic concepts.

Numerous studies of high school civics and government textbooks include similar findings. The most extensive and significant of these studies was conducted by the Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education of the American Political Science Association. The Committee wrote a scathing critique of the textbooks, which tended to include numerous factual errors, omission of controversial topics, and misconceptions of political processes.[35] Cox, Cousins, and Palmer, among others, have written similar critical reviews of the inadequacies of middle school and high school history textbooks.[36]

Leaders in economics education also cite lack of emphasis on their subject in school curricula as a major cause of low-level citizen knowledge. They note in a U.S. Office of Education report that only about one-fourth of the nation's secondary schools offer courses in economics and only abut 7% of the students take these courses.[37] M.L. Frankel, former Executive Director of the Joint Council on Economic Education, points out that 50% or more of all our nation's social studies teachers have never taken a course in economics. Only 12 states require high school social studies teachers to have any preparation in economics.[38]

A recent report sponsored by the Organization of American Historians reveals a decline in emphasis on the teaching of American history in high schools during the past 20 years.[39]

During the past generation, the mass media of communications, especially television, have assumed an increasing significance in the education of citizens. Our youngsters (ages 12-18) spend about one-fifth of their waking time watching television programs.[40] Television appears to be the main source of information about domestic civic affairs and about international relations for most children in the sixth and seventh grades.[41] Up to this point in school, students usually have not experienced extensive formal education about politics and government. However, adolescents also cite television and newspapers, as well as schools, as main sources of information about civic affairs and other peoples and countries. As children grow older, parents become much less important as sources of information.[42]

Studies of adults show clearly that television and newspapers are the media from which they receive most of their political information. Very few adults receive large amounts of their political information from the radio or magazines.[43] One researcher has concluded that:

> The more an individual is exposed to political information via the mass media . . . the more likely he is to vote, be interested in the political system and know more about it.[44]

There is a relationship between socio-economic status and the use of the media to obtain political knowledge; higher status people are more likely than lower status people to use these sources.[45]

Some researchers argue that extensive exposure to television accounts for extensive public misinformation and misconception of foreign peoples and cultures and of the involvement of the United States in foreign affairs. Beyer and Perry say, "The misinformation that students have about Africa may come primarily from the popular media." Entertainment programs such as "Tarzan" are primarily responsible for such misinformation.[46]

If television is part of the problem of civic education, it also offers possibilities for alleviating deficiencies in citizens' knowledge. Various exemplary programs produced and transmitted to homes through commercial stations and to schools via educational television services have shown this medium's ample potential for raising the knowledge levels of masses of citizens.[47]

The preceding discussion has presented generalizations about the status and sources of citizen knowledge. Following is a discussion of particular programs, associated with various sectors of society, which illustrate in more detail the sources of citizen knowledge.

Illustrative Programs

Every sector of society contributes information citizens require for effective action. Undoubtedly some information is more objective than another; some information may be intended primarily to promote the special interest of the information source. But all information about civic and political life contributes to the knowledge base possessed by American citizens.

Schools

For young people the school is the primary agency for citizen education, and within schools, the social studies curriculum is the key, but by no means the exclusive, arena for citizen education. Indeed, "citizenship" and "character development" were two of "seven cardinal principles" cited in the 1918 Report on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. The primacy of citizenship

development in schooling has been reconfirmed on many occasions since the 1918 report was first published.

For the most part, social studies draws its data, concepts, and generalizations from a wide range of social science and humanities disciplines, selecting what is most relevant to citizen education. Often, especially in the secondary grades, the term "social studies" is used merely to stand for courses in history, political science, geography, sociology, etc. But even in these cases, when American history is taught as a separate course, the intention is to select content that should be of optimum value to the learner as citizen rather than one planning to become a historian.

The social studies curriculum is rarely stable. Reformers continuously identify deficiencies requiring remediation. Decisions about what can be sacrificed, what requires improvement, and what should be added are linked closely to the moods and priorities of society as a whole.

For example, it was noted in the early 1960's that courses in civics and American government had failed to keep step with the field of political science as pursued by scholars. The findings and perspectives resulting from nearly two decades of research on political behavior had prompted vast changes in the political science discipline but had not influenced secondary school instruction. One response was the development of a new twelfth-grade American government course entitled American Political Behavior that provides high school students with the concepts and modes of analysis political scientists have found useful for understanding political life in the United States. This course, utilizing a vast array of instructional ideas, now rivals the more traditional approaches that ignored political behavior research.

The rise in crime, especially among youth, and the woeful ignorance of American students about the legal process led the American Bar Association to establish the Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship. The Committee serves as a catalyst and clearinghouse for programs in law-related civic education in all of the 50 states. Hundreds of projects, involving close collaboration between school systems, colleges and universities, and local bar associations, have appeared. Many specialize in in-service and pre-service training of teachers; others have focused on the creation of new instructional materials. Some projects have emphasized practical law, while others have focused on the more abstract legal principles underlying governmental systems. In all cases, there is an attempt to develop an awareness of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, and of the law as a primary means of resolving conflict in our society. Two of the most successful curriculum development efforts are the Law in a Free Society Project and the Law in American

Society Project, originally a joint effort by the Chicago Bar Association and the Chicago Board of Education. The former has tended to emphasize materials for the elementary grades, the latter for secondary grades.

Another of many important projects is the Constitutional Rights Foundation with headquarters in Los Angeles and regional Offices in other parts of the country. This project began as an effort to strengthen instruction about the Bill of Rights. It no longer is limited to this topic, but the Bill of Rights continues to attract much of its attention.

Some educators argue that citizenship today can be best understood in a global context. Global studies educators do not minimize the importance of understanding national government, but they are quick to point out that many of the most important problems facing the American people cannot be solved by the national government alone. Military defense, environmental pollution, trade, energy and raw materials are all examples of topics that exhibit global interdependent features.

A number of organizations promote global studies in the schools. These include the Mid-America Program for Global Perspectives in Education and Global Perspectives, Inc. Also the 60 or so foreign language and area studies centers based in universities around the country not only provide for advanced studies on various regions of the world, but through their "outreach" programs, they bring information about world regions and issues to the attention of business people, school teachers, and others.

Ethnic studies programs have also emerged in recent years. Many of these programs try to improve intergroup relations by examining the role, contributions, and needs of ethnic groups in American society.

Business

American business contributes importantly to citizen education. One kind of citizen education is directed to employees. For example, the Dow Chemical Company conducts a series of seminars for its workers that explain the functions of the Federal government, especially the Executive branch, the Congress, and the regulatory agencies. The program explains how politics works and how citizens can exert influence if they will only choose to become active.

Business also attempts to educate and influence the public as a whole. Bethlehem Steel Corporation has run a set of two-page advertisements in leading magazines. On one side of the page is information about such topics as the growing American dependence upon foreign fuel; the opposite page is blank except for the inside address of the President, or a Senator, or a member of the House of Representatives. Readers are invited to read the information in the ad and then send their opinions to the President or a member of Congress.

Another kind of citizen education is public service. Giant Food Inc. conducts a program in consumer education. Each store has a Consumer Information Center where customers can pick up booklets containing advice relating to the purchase of meat, poultry, seafood, poisonous plants, generic drugs, and toys. Safeway provides a similar service for its customers.

In some instances, the business and government sectors sponsor educational programs jointly through the media. This was the case in the presentation of the Adams Chronicles on public television, paid for in part by the Atlantic Richfield Company and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Labor

Organized labor sponsors many kinds of citizen education programs. Some are directed to labor union members; others are aimed at the public at large.

An example of the latter is a publication by the AFL-CIO, entitled "Labor Looks at the 94th Congress" (January, 1977). A pamphlet of this type is published at the close of each Congressional term. The bulletin treats important issues that confront Congress -- e.g., the economy, housing, labor legislation, civil rights, foreign affairs -- summarizes the actions taken by Congress according to party votes, indicates the AFL-CIO position on each issue and any influence it had on the outcome. This bulletin is given wide circulation as a means of informing the public broadly of labor's position on important issues.

Union leadership is also concerned about the education of its own members. Unions publish material about the history of the American labor movement and why compulsory bargaining is consistent with American democratic principles. They also provide information about how the political system functions. For example, the Indiana State AFL-CIO publishes a pamphlet on law-making in the Indiana General Assembly, entitled "An Illustrated Story about How a Bill Becomes a Law." Literature on how to register to vote

and how to mark the ballot are also common. The AFL-CIO publishes a number of other pamphlets on topics deemed to be of interest and value to its members. Recent titles include: "What Every Worker Should Know about Drug Use"; "Let the Buyer Beware"; "Consumers: The Uphill Fight"; "National Health Care"; "Taxes and Tax Reform."

Publications are not the only way that unions provide instruction for members who are seeking further education. Many colleges and universities conduct classes, sponsor special seminars, and hold week-end retreats for union members on both a credit and non-credit basis. The subject matter of these special programs varies enormously from intensive leadership training, to more general education leading to an associate or baccalaureate degree, to such specialized efforts as English as a second language, preparation for naturalization, and programs for Chinese-speaking or Spanish-speaking members.

Professional Associations

Many professional associations contribute to citizen education. For example, the American Political Science Association has a Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education that sponsors a number of citizen education programs. One of its projects, the High School Political Science Curriculum Project, has produced a new high school government course entitled Comparing Political Experiences that attempts to enhance student capacity to understand and participate in politics in a variety of settings from schools to international organizations. APSA also publishes the DEA News that regularly features articles aimed at promoting instructions about politics in colleges and universities.

Some professional associations will emphasize a particular topic about which they wish to educate their own members and the general public. The Business and Professional Women have done this in conjunction with their campaign for passage of the Equal Rights Amendment.

The National Council for Social Studies is the principal professional association for American social studies teachers, and it has defined the promotion and improvement of citizen education to be one of its main purposes. Thus publications, conferences, and other activities reveal a strong citizen education emphasis.

Government

Government contributes vastly to the knowledge citizens need

to become more aware of the issues facing the society. A flood of documents ranging from the Congressional Record to such bulletins as how to make a Social Security claim appear daily, making the Government Printing Office one of the largest publishers in the world.

In addition, elected representatives at the national and local level often keep their constituents informed about legislative activities through newsletters.

But the government is not restricted to publications as a way for educating citizens. Some of the agencies sponsor leaves for their employees in which the Federal employee assumes residence on a college campus for a year. The employee is refreshed by the break; students and faculty gain the advantage of the employee's knowledge and experience. The process works in the opposite way as well. Professors may be given leave by their universities and take a temporary assignment in a Federal agency such as the National Science Foundation. The direct experience acquired on the job is later communicated to others on the campus.

Several programs enable high school students to experience government first hand. One of these is CloseUp. CloseUp conducts week-long, highly intensive workshops in Washington, D.C. throughout the academic year for students in grades 10, 11, and 12. A prominent feature of CloseUp is the opportunity for students to question many of the key people within and outside of government who are influencing public policy. Students are coached by the CloseUp staff to ask good questions and to secure the information they want.

Both high school and college students have opportunities to work briefly as unpaid interns for local, state and federal officials. The Institute for Political/Legal Education is one program for high school age students that has combined classroom instruction with internship experience.

Media

Much of the information citizens receive about civic and community life comes from the mass media -- newspapers, news magazines, radio, and television. Prime Time School Television was established to help teachers take greater advantage of the information sources provided by commercial T.V. PTST distributes guides to be used by teachers in conjunction with certain television programs, most notably "specials." In 1976, PTST piloted a new program called "Television, Police and the Law" in English and social studies classes. The project provides some written materials for

classroom use together with a "Constitutional Awareness Chart" which students use as a checklist when watching police shows on television. The students are encouraged to form judgments about how realistic police shows are and to what degree the shows demonstrate violations of constitutional rights.

Television specials for general audiences have been presented by the commercial networks on such topics as defense, foreign policy, and energy. These programs help fulfill network public service requirements and present broad analyses of specific issues to the public.

Voluntary Associations

A great many voluntary associations contribute importantly to the fund of available information citizens need. Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts are well known for their citizen education emphasis. Lodges, ethnic clubs, neighborhood associations, veterans' organizations, and many others contribute importantly to this process for adults.

One of the best known organizations active in citizen education is the League of Women Voters. Founded in 1920, the League's original purpose was to help prepare newly enfranchised women voters to exercise their rights. But the League's activities have been directed at serving all voters rather than women exclusively.

League chapters exist in each state and in many local communities. The League has earned a reputation for the skillful nonpartisan approach it adopts toward researching issues, and the force and energy it exerts in promoting its views on issues once they are decided.

The League publishes issue-oriented materials that are given wide circulation, testifies before legislative and administrative hearings, lobbies on behalf of its positions, presents open forums and analyses of the stands on issues of specific candidates in election campaigns, and monitors election activities. Active League members are among the best-informed citizens in the United States about key issues facing the nation and their local communities.

The Institute for the Study of Civic Values is a non-profit organization based in Philadelphia. Its clients are mainly workers, ethnic minorities, and the poor. Its instruction programs are aimed at promoting traditional American values, at heightening political consciousness, and imparting political skills. Recently, the Institute has provided the headquarters for a new

organization called the Alliance for Citizen Education that hopes to build a network among citizen education specialists drawn from all sectors of the society.

SKILLS ASSOCIATED WITH EFFECTIVE CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Ample knowledge is not sufficient for effective citizen participation in civic arenas. Unless citizens have the capacity to identify and evaluate relevant information and the skill to use it effectively, their capability to influence public policies will be limited. Citizens need to know how to identify the main point of disagreement, to weigh contending points of view, to predict consequences, to calculate the costs and benefits of one solution over another, and to understand the procedures through which one decides and acts. They also need to know how to state an argument clearly, to mobilize resources on behalf of their side, and to implement a decision once made.

In short, effective citizenship requires the development of skills in thinking and participation as a group member. The effective citizen is a thinker who has the ability to use evidence to support or reject factual claims and to use knowledge of make and appraise decisions. The effective citizen is also a doer who is able to advocate ideas, bargain, organize resources, and administer people and things.

Citizens' Skills as Thinkers and Participants

In contrast to the knowledge domain, there is a paucity of data about citizens' skills as thinkers and participants. However, the limited data suggests that adolescents tend to lack ability to think about political ideas at abstract levels.[48] Only 20% of a sample of older adolescents studied by Lockwood demonstrated high-level ability when thinking about public issues. Only 50% of this sample showed any evidence at all that they could do higher level thinking.[49]

The National Assessment studies have indicated the likelihood of low-level participation skills among citizens.[50] Less than 50% of the 17-year-old respondents could identify as many as three ways that citizens can influence government. Only 25% could identify four political participation techniques, and only 11% could identify five techniques. One might assume that this obvious lack of knowledge of participation techniques reflects low-level participation skill. Indeed, less than 50% of these respondents could interpret and mark a sample ballot correctly. However,

this same study did indicate that both 13-year-olds and 17-year-olds have the capability to cooperate in a small group setting to complete an assigned task.

Joseph Adelson and several associates have done crossnational studies of thinking ability involving American, German, and British youth at four grade levels (fifth, seventh, ninth, and twelfth). These studies have indicated that children of different age groups have different capacities for political learning. Prior to age 13, most youngsters can not comprehend highly abstract political concepts such as governments, society, democracy, or freedom. Preadolescents focus on the tangible and the concrete; they tend to personalize institutions and events.[51]

According to the Adelson studies, the 13-year-old is at the threshold of ability to deal with political abstractions, to reason from premises, to extrapolate from what is known to what is probably true about the unknown, to speculate and to theorize.[52]

Fifteen-year-olds can think competently and consistently in terms of political abstractions. They show ability to project consequences and to specify probable outcomes of particular conditions; they can infer conclusions from premises and extrapolate generalizations from data; they can relate concepts and propositions to construct theories. In short, what the 13-year-old does inconsistently and irregularly, the 15-year-old can do unhesitantly and unfalteringly.[53]

According to the Adelson studies, the most extensive increase in capacity for political learning takes place between ages 11 and 13. During this period, there is a marked softening in the more absolutistic, either/or style of thinking associated with childhood. There is a demonstration of capability to reason probabilistically. There is the beginning of capability to examine systematically the probable gains and losses associated with different political decisions or behaviors.

These studies suggest that high school students tend to have the capacity to achieve skills necessary to high-level thinking about civic participation. Perhaps the failure of most students to achieve these skills is associated with deficiencies in civic education in schools and in other sectors of society.

Social Bases of Citizenship Skill Development

Educational leaders have assumed special responsibility for the development of thinking skills. They have linked this responsibility to education for good citizenship. For example, the NEA Educational Policies Commission proclaimed:

> Effective citizenship is impossible without the ability to think . . . [The responsibile citizen] must have . . . the intellectual means to study events, to relate his values to them, and to make wise decisions as to his own actions.[54]

Among institutions in our society, only the school has assumed the special mission of developing the thinking skills of masses of students as part of general, public educational programs. If schools do this job poorly, it is not likely that other institutions will remedy the deficiencies, given the present constitution of our society.

Sectors of society, other than the school, have usually had more responsibility for developing participation skills of citizens. Various youth and adult groups have by tradition taught skills of group governance in settings where citizens learn by doing.

Numerous studies have revealed a strong relationship between educational attainment and higher level ability to think and participate.[55] However, this relationship is confounded by socio-economic status. It seems that people from higher socio-economic statuses have more opportunity to develop skills in thinking and participating associated with competent performances of essential citizenship tasks. One study compared civic education of schools in a middle class community, a lower-middle class community, and a working class community.[56] The researcher found that youngsters in the middle class community were receiving a more realistic and high-powered civic education designed to develop leadership capabilities. In contrast, civic education in the other two communities emphasized duties of citizenship, obedience to rules, and acceptance of the status quo rather than development of thinking skills and understanding of political processes. The study concluded that the civic education in the lower status communities did not "encourage a belief in the citizen's ability to influence government action through political participation."[57]

Schools often contribute to the political disabilities of lower-status citizens. Curriculum content is often geared toward simple and direct indoctrination of patriotic cliches and prescrip-

tion of ideals. Students, especially those in lower status communities, are often exposed to authoritarian educational climates where skills in thinking may be honored abstractly as school goals; but they are not taught systematically and their use is discouraged. These students are not encouraged to express their own opinions, to participate in decision-making activities, to assume important responsibilities at school, or to think critically or creatively.

People who belong to lower status families have much less opportunity than others to develop skills associated with effective citizen participation. Family status may limit or expand a person's social contacts and opportunities. A family's social position often determines the people and groups to which a person will be exposed. Young citizens in an affluent suburban family will have more opportunities to associate with individuals and groups who may foster development of skills in thinking and participating. In contrast, young citizens in a poor inner-city or rural family will have much less opportunity to belong to groups or to interact with individuals who can teach them skills needed for effective civic action.

Lower status youth are more likely to be part of a community in which out-of-school citizenship education opportunities are limited. Meanwhile, they are likely to attend schools with deficient citizenship education programs. As a consequence of the limited in-school and out-of-school education experiences, they often fail to develop skills necessary to effective citizenship. In contrast, youngsters from higher status families are more likely to learn skills in thinking and participating at home or from other out-of-school educational opportunities provided by their better-endowed parents and communities.

Community support has much to do with whether or not young people learn skills in thinking and participating which are necessary for effective citizenship. Schools are more likely to do a better job of teaching these skills when prompted and supported by parent groups and community leaders. Non-school groups in the community are more likely to assume more responsibilities for civic education if they are prodded, guided, and supported to move in this direction by parents and local leaders.

Following are examples of civic education programs, in various sectors of society, which presumably may contribute to the development of citizenship skills.

Illustrative Programs

Many agencies provide information citizens need to reach conclusions about social and political issues. Far fewer groups provide the skill training citizens must have to make optimum use of available information. A few selected programs are described below.

Schools

Certain skills -- reading, writing, and computation -- are given major attention in school. Skills in locating and making judgments about information are also taught. However, very little explicit attention is typically devoted to political participation skills.

One exception is the "Citizen Decision-Making" Project of the Mershon Center at Ohio State University. This project has developed supplementary materials designed to teach the skills of making, judging, and influencing decisions in everyday life. CDM consists of short, self-contained lessons for use by teachers in grades 4-8. Throughout students employ a device called a "decision tree" which helps them sort out the alternatives facing them and permits them to make judgments about the costs and benefits of choosing one solution over another. The kinds of issues presented to students range from the most immediate and personal -- e.g., what to do about a classroom bully -- to national and international ones.

Fred Newmann has been working with the Madison, Wisconsin Public Schools to produce a new high school citizen education curriculum for eleventh and twelfth grade students. Students earn both English and social studies credits while enrolled in the program. The curriculum emphasizes important citizen skills in communication, moral deliberation, participation, leadership, and decision-making. These skills and others are practiced by direct action in the community.

The Agency for Instructional Television is developing 60 fifteen-minute color television programs and related print materials to support its Essential Learning Skills Project. The Project is designed for use with fifth and sixth graders. Primary attention is being devoted to skills in communication, mathematics, and critical thinking. Threaded throughout the series will be lessons on citizen decision-making.

Labor

The AFL-CIO devotes considerable attention to teaching its

members skills that are useful for effective citizen action. Much leadership training occurs at the George Meany Center for Labor Studies at Silver Spring, Maryland. During 1976-77, 36 Labor Studies institutes and programs were offered on this 47-acre campus. Institutes focused on such topics as "How to Improve Your Leadership Skills", "Psychology for Union Leaders", "Arbitration", "Collective Bargaining", and "Civil Rights".

For the majority who are unable to attend sessions at the George Meany Center, the union conducts institutes, seminars, and programs on college campuses and through the union locals. In addition, numerous publications are offered. Examples include: "How to Run a Union Meeting", "AFL-CIO Manual for Shop Stewards", "20 Ideas for Steward Meetings", and a leadership training manual. Unions depend upon effective leaders; The AFL-CIO assumes it must provide the training programs necessary to produce such leaders.

Home

Some students acquire the skills necessary for effective citizen education from their parents at home. Families that encourage discussion and debate and invite children to participate in making family decisions can cultivate skill development even in young children. Parents who model citizen education practices and who take time to teach their children can be very effective. For children who are deprived of these opportunities, the school may be unable to provide sufficient help to compensate for the difference in home training.

Few programs establish direct linkages between parenting and citizen education. Some of these might, however, be modified to incorporate citizen education components. The Home and School Institute has undertaken programs aimed at helping schools assist parents to become more effective tutors of their children. One of these involves "home learning activities." Each activity is written in recipe-style on a single sheet of paper. Each activity costs little or nothing to implement, is easy to understand, and helps students apply what is learned at school to situations at home. Most important of all, these simple activities strengthen the role of parent as tutor and demonstrate to children that the parents value education. Increasing the parents' effectiveness also enhances the role model the parents set for their children.

Voluntary Associations

Some citizens acquire skills by working for voluntary organizations engaged in citizen education. One kind of organization that has appeared on college campuses since the late 1960's is the "public interest research group." These groups, composed

mainly of college students and begun by Ralph Nader, research issues of interest to the public as a whole, take a position, then lobby on behalf of their position.

The Indiana Public Interest Research Group of Bloomington, Inc. (InPIRG) has concentrated recently on three broad issues: clean environment, consumer protection, and safe power. Under consumer protection it provides comparative information each month on prices in local grocery stores in order that consumers may know which stores consistently offer lowest prices. It has recently completed a survey of services, education, and fees of local doctors, and has conducted a study of services and fees of local banks. With regard to clean environment it campaigned for legislation requiring a deposit on carbonated beverage containers and opposed the use of flip-top disposable cans. It also intervened in a hearing regarding the disposal of PCB's (Polychlorinated bi-phenyls) into the Bloomington sewer system. Skills in research, interviewing, data manipulation, and argumentation are needed regularly by InPIRG members. Skills are learned on the job and applied in real situations.

The National Neighborhood Training Institute was established in 1976 to offer practical courses and internships aimed at providing the skills needed by neighborhood leaders, organizers, religious, and service workers who wish to be effective in neighborhood organizations. A training program that combines a six-month internship in a neighborhood organization with 2½ day off-site monthly training sessions with experienced organizers and two-week summer institutes are two kinds of programs available through the Institute.

The New England Training Center for Community Organizers is yet another place where community organizers can receive training. Ten-day intensive training programs, monthly seminars, and consultation services for community organizations are three ways NETCCO seeks to respond to the need to strengthen the citizen skills those active in community organizations require.

ATTITUDES ASSOCIATED WITH EFFECTIVE CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Attitudes pertain to an individual's orientations or preferences toward some object, person, or event.[58] Attitudes associated with essential tasks of citizenship have to do with feelings of accepting or rejecting about country and community, public issues, political events, public policy decisions, etc.

Effective citizen participation in our society would seem to require attitudes such as these: identification with community, interest in civic affairs, feelings of personal effectiveness, a sense of political efficacy. It seems unlikely that citizens with little or no concern about public issues or policies or with strong feelings of powerlessness could be effective participants in various public arenas.

Given long-standing political practices and commitment to democratic ideas in our society, these attitudes would also seem to be appropriate focal points of citizenship education: respect for lawful, orderly settlement of differences, respect for human rights and dignity, commitment to majority rule as a means for settling public conflicts, and support for the protection of dissenters from the majority.

Civic Attitudes of Citizens

The importance of the citizen attitude domain is underscored by this statement from the National Assessment study:

> The individual rights of every citizen are carefully defined in the Constitution, but the enjoyment of those rights and the freedoms of a democracy are dependent upon their acceptance by all members of a free society and their equal application to all.[59]

What civic attitudes do American citizens tend to express?

Civic Tolerance

Americans are quick to declare agreement with abstract statements of democratic ideals. However, these fundamental ideals are often little more than empty slogans. Large numbers of citizens of different age groups do not accept certain ramifications of these basic ideals, especially as they pertain to civil liberties and the rights of minority groups. This phenomenon has been revealed in numerous studies from the 1950's through the 1970's.[60]

Most children, grades 5-9, studied by Zellman and Sears expressed support in the abstract for the rights of individuals to free speech. Virtually all agreed with this statement: "I believe in free speech for all no matter what their views might be." However, these same children expressed low levels of political tolerance for the free speech rights of various unpopular minorities.[61]

Although older youngsters are more likely than preadolescents

to think critically about particular laws and authorities, they still display tendencies toward intolerance of particular types of dissent. For example, only 25% of a nationally representative sample of 13-year-olds would allow the expression of atheistic or agnostic beliefs on television. Less than half of the 17-year-olds in this sample would tolerate the public expression of these unorthodox beliefs. Only 3% of these 13-year-olds and 17% of the 17-year-olds specified freedom of speech as a reason to allow the expression of unorthodox beliefs on television. Only 55% of this sample of 13-year-olds believe that "it is all right for a person to tell other people if he thinks the Governor or President is doing a bad job and can give a reason why in terms of free speech."[62]

Harris found similar responses among a national sample of adults who, while proclaiming a strong belief in democracy, also declared:

> (1) Authorities should have the right to censor TV, radio, newspapers, and the theater for unpatriotic or revolutionary content (57%); (2) Attendance at campus protest meetings ought to be grounds for expulsion of a college student (48%); and (3) FBI agents should be able to testify in criminal cases without cross-examination (50%).[63]

Compared to citizens of the 1950's and 1960's, today's adolescents are much less likely to express blatant racial or ethnic prejudice in their responses to social attitude questionnaires. For example, large majorities of 13-year-old and 17-year-old respondents express general acceptance and support for equal social or economic opportunities of various racial or ethnic groups.[64]

Attitudes About Other Peoples and Governments

Children and adolescents tend to have negative stereotypes of other peoples who are perceived as enemies, such as communistic nations; Russia and China, for example, are viewed very negatively.[65] Jahoda found that children are prone to judge countries similar to their own favorably and to be either patronizing or hostile to those seen as strange.[66] Peoples and governments perceived as similar to ours, such as Canada and Great Britain, are rated favorably by children and adolescents.[67]

Several cross-national studies of cognitive development suggest that the period between ages 8-12 is an opportune time to influence attitudes toward other peoples. During this period of de-

velopment, children are more likely to be open-minded and flexible in their views of others. They are also beginning to develop the capability to think abstractly and in "more or less" rather than strict "either-or" terms. Educators who foster open-minded thinking about other peoples and places might be able to counteract the rigid, stereotype thinking about other peoples and places which so many of our citizens display.[68] As we look to a future of increased global interdependence, the broadening of our citizens' attitudes in this area will be increasingly important.

National Loyalty

Feelings of national loyalty develop early and continue to be strong throughout adolescence. Our people, our nation, our government, and our leaders tend to be viewed very positively.[69] American children revere the role of President, feel that political leaders generally are benevolent, accept the authority of government as legitimate and just, and venerate patriotic symbols.

Children acquire generally favorable attitudes about political authority, leaders, the political system, etc., prior to learning relevant knowledge. Not until the 7th and 8th grades do children begin to buttress their beliefs with substantial pertinent knowledge.

During adolescence, "de-idealization" about politics and governments begins. Ordinarily, adolescence is a period when hallowed traditions are questioned and when idols may be shattered. The favorable attitudes children bring into adolescence may be shaken when they become increasingly knowledgeable about the gap between civic ideals and sordid realities disclosed via newspapers, television, or discussions with family or peer group members. However, most adolescents, like most adults, retain a generally favorable set of attitudes about their nation and political system.

During the 1970's, in response to sordid events such as the Watergate Affair, Americans tended to express more cynicism than usual toward basic institutions and leaders. Various opinion polls showed a sharp decline in the trust of citizens toward government, other social institutions, and leaders.[70] However, these surveys did not demonstrate rejection of hallowed traditions or ideals. Rather, they showed dislike of leaders and events which represented serious contradictions of these traditions and ideals.

Support for Law and Order

Our citizens are strongly supportive of the need for rules,

law, and order. The vast majority of adults are law-abiding citizens who understand and support the need for public order. Our youth also appear to understand that the essential function of law is to regulate human relationships for the purpose of minimizing disorder and protecting the rights of individuals.[71] A nationally representative sample of young people, ages 17-23, indicated overwhelmingly that they would welcome "more emphasis on law and order" and could easily accept "the power and authority of the police."[72]

The beliefs of American youth about the functions of law vary with age. Younger children stress the negative coercive function of law and the value of single-minded obedience to law. They see themselves as relatively powerless against authorities. They tend to attribute personal qualities to legal institutions and to demonstrate incapability to think abstractly about either legal principles or the potential social consequences of legal actions.[73]

In contrast, older youth are more likely to have complex beliefs about law and order. They are more likely to stress the administrative and service function of government and law and to emphasize the potentiality of law to enhance human rights and capabilities. Many older youngsters are able to think abstractly about the law and about legal institutions and to ponder the possible social consequences of legal decisions.[74]

American adolescents appear to value coercive aspects of law and order more strongly than equal opportunity within a legal framework. Seventy-eight per cent of a nationally representative sample of adolescents, ages 17-23, agreed that "there is too much concern with equality and too little with law and order."[75] Another nationally representative sample of American adolescents indicated slight awareness of the difficulties which some minority groups have experienced in trying to achieve equality before the law or in other areas of life.[76]

Low-Level Expression of Political Interest and Efficacy

Political attitude studies from the 1950's through the 1970's have shown that our citizens, both adolescents and adults, express low levels of political interest and efficacy. Although Americans tend to express favorable general attitudes about political participation as an ideal, most feel that they are likely to have little or no effect on public policy decisions.

A study of adolescents in Lexington, Kentucky revealed low levels of political interest and high levels of political powerlessness.[78] Pollster Lou Harris found low levels of political trust

and feelings of political efficacy among a national sample of adults.[79]

Social Bases of Citizen Attitudes

Teaching students to be supportive of national ideals and traditions has been a long-standing goal of civic educators. The schools, and other sectors of society, seem to have done an effective job of instilling basic loyalty and general positive feelings toward our political and social traditions and institutions.

However, a less effective job has been done in teaching about the complexities of civil liberties in a democracy. Schools, and other agencies of civic education in our society, have not taught lessons of civic tolerance adequately. Indeed, examination of textbooks and television programs, two main sources of children's learning about others, reveals much chauvinistic and ethnocentric content. These media of instruction often have contributed to unfavorable stereotypes of minority groups at home and of various peoples and cultures around the world.

Educational television programs offer potential for encouraging favorable civic attitudes. Several studies have indicated that "children who watch programs that depict positive social behavior will act according to these examples."[80] Youngsters can be prompted to acquire positive attitudes through role-modeling, a process through which "a person patterns his thoughts, feelings, or actions after another person who serves as a model."[81] The viewer may imitate the model without being induced or compelled to do so. One report states:

> There is considerable evidence that children do learn by watching and listening to others even in the absence of reinforcement or overt practice.[82]

Thus, it seems possible to use television, more aptly than we have yet done, to teach exemplary civic attitudes and behavior, which might contribute substantially to improving the quality of our civic life by encouraging a wider acceptance of democratic attitudes among masses of citizens.

An "irony of democracy" is the greater likelihood of various social and political elites to more extensively (than the masses of citizens) express the civil libertarian themes of classical democratic theory.[83] These elites seem more likely than the working class or others of lower status to support the civil liberties of minorities. At the very least, they are more likely

to know the "right" answers on the political attitude questionnaires of survey researchers.

A reality of political life is that higher status people are more likely to express political interest and efficacy than those occupying lower socio-economic statuses.[84] Higher status people are more likely to learn the knowledge and skills which foster efficacy and interest from parents and from educational opportunities (both inside and outside of school) which are provided by their more advantaged social positions. In short, the children of those who have "made it" are more likely than others to acquire attitudes necessary to effective citizen action.

Following is a discussion of programs, conducted in various sectors of our society, which reveal how civic attitudes are taught.

Illustrative Programs

For many it is difficult to think of citizen education without the cultivation of good attitudes. Indeed, in many elementary schools, report cards once reserved a space for a citizenship grade. This grade did not acknowledge cognitive achievement. Rather, it noted the student's attitude: Was he always on time; was his home work complete and neat; was he polite, trustworthy, and respectful of school property. While it is not necessary to accept this limited view of citizenship, it is clear that attitudes -- and behind attitudes, values -- are an important part of citizen education.

Schools

No aspect of schooling is more controversial than the effort on the part of educators to provide appropriate instruction in values, ethics, and morals. Clearly, the school cannot avoid such instruction; implicitly, if not explicitly, the school teaches values through the role models set by its teachers, the rules used to govern the school, and so on. At one time schools were more confident about the values to be taught. Bible reading and prayer at the start of each school day played an important role in values training.

Today, educators lack clear guidelines regarding the approach they should take to values education. In recent years, emphasis has shifted from a concern that students acquire specific substantive values such as honesty, loyalty, and patriotism to a focus on the process of valuing. "Values Clarification", a process developed by Louis Raths, Merrill Harmin, Sidney B. Simon,

Leland Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum, consists of activities aimed at helping individuals and groups to develop and clarify their values. According to its proponents, individuals and groups are subject to value confusion and a lack of perceived purpose. Values clarification enables students to think through their value choices, to weigh some against others, to decide which they prize the most, and to begin acting consistently on their chosen values. Values clarification has become very popular with some teachers, in part because of the attention-arousing student activities it employs.

"Moral education" is a term used often to stand for efforts to apply the findings of Lawrence Kohlberg's research on the cognitive moral development of children. According to Kohlberg, people think about moral issues in six, qualitatively different states. These states are arranged in a hierarchical order; one cannot proceed to stage six without having passed through stages one to five; and one may cease development at any particular stage. An individual reasons predominately at one stage of thought, although the person sometimes operates at lower stages and can sometimes understand arguments at a stage one or two higher than the one at which he reasons.

Moral educators reason that it is better to operate at a higher stage than a lower one. Thus, the task for education is to plan interventions which have the effect of moving students to higher stages than they might otherwise achieve without the intervention.

Edwin Fenton has worked closely with Kohlberg and is now applying moral development principles to the design of a civic education program for a select number of high schools in and adjacent to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The program includes the development of new social studies and English courses in which citizen education ideas are presented and the establishment of a "community meeting" within the school at which democratic principles are applied as students devise their own rules of governance and punish lawbreakers.

Business

Business, too, has an interest in promoting appropriate civic attitudes both with employees and with the public generally. Continuing success in business requires employees who are honest and willing to work hard for their wages. Business success is also influenced by the strength of the government and the general political climate.

On July 4, 1976, the Alton Box Board Company launched a program

called "Half Hour a Day for the USA." The purpose of the program was to focus employee interest on what ordinary citizens can do to strengthen the United States at all levels.

The first phase was to ask employees for suggestions regarding what might be done to make the United States a better place to live and work. To increase interest, prizes were offered for the best ideas. The second phase was a mock election held three weeks before the general election in November, 1976. A goal was to stimulate additional interest in the election campaign. The third phase began in January, 1977. Employees were asked to volunteer for a project or cause suggested during phase one. The projects are of great variety and include such examples as "ask the pastor of your church to talk from the pulpit about citizens' obligations and privileges of a free America", "donate blood to your local blood bank or area hospital", "join in as a volunteer fireman", "become active in your local 'Big Brother' program", and "attend your local city council meetings." Alton workers are asked to keep a log on their activities. Again, prizes are being offered to those who seem to be making the greatest contributions.

Religion

Outside of the family probably no other institution has such a profound effect on value formation as organized religion. The various religious faiths are usually more clear about the values to be acquired than are secular institutions and they offer rewards and punishments that to the believer exceed those available from secular institutions. At least once a week -- and for some more often than this -- millions of religious followers gather in churches, cathedrals, synogogues, and meeting halls to listen to messages about right conduct. Even those who fail to attend regularly cannot avoid being affected by this influence.

A special concern of religious organizations is how to help members relate their religious beliefs to current social problems. To meet this need, religious organizations prepare instructional materials to be used in church-school courses. An especially notable example is "Doing the Word", a multi-media program available from the United Church Board for Homeland Ministries. Instructional materials intended for use with both children and adults treat such topics as ethical choices for political and economic action, education for justice, world hunger, peace, and racism. Games, records, filmstrips, audio-tapes, suggestions for community activity, essays, and collected readings are some of the many approaches employed by the program.

A typical example of one of the instructional units is a

packet of materials entitled, "I was Hungry." The packet contains a sound filmstrip providing an overview of the hunger issue, a monograph providing in-depth treatment on eight aspects of the hunger problem, special issues of Church and Society and Youth magazines that focus on world hunger, and a teacher's guide to the packet. Exposure to the program should arouse more awareness and concern for the problem of world hunger by the participants and indicate to them some ways they can contribute to the amelioration of the hunger issue.

Voluntary Associations

One attraction of voluntary associations for many Americans is the opportunity to join with others in efforts to combat prejudice leading to discrimination and violations of civil rights. Some groups work on broad civil liberties issues. The American Civil Liberties Union, for example, is concerned with three general areas: 1) freedom of speech, press, association, assembly and religion; 2) due process of law covering all elements of a fair trial; and 3) equal treatment under law regardless of race, national origin, sex or ethnic background. The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith provides consultant services for various organizations working on behalf of better inter-group relations. It also publishes books and pamphlets on minority groups and inter-group relations.

Other voluntary associations tend to focus on affecting attitudes toward a particular minority group. Examples include the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Congress of American Indians, and the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs. Through these and other associations citizens have opportunities to work with others to remove class, ethnic, and racial barriers in the United States.

PARTICIPATION EXPERIENCES OF CITIZENS

Responsible citizenship requires more than knowledge, skills, and positive attitudes. It also requires action. The ultimate end of education for good citizenship ought to be the ability to use knowledge and skills to influence public affairs.

Participation experiences may be a rich source of civic education. Citizens may learn most extensively about the governance of groups by taking part in group activities.

Patterns of Citizen Participation

Patterns of citizen participation in public affairs are not consistent with the rhetoric of civic educators, who call for an active citzenry. Numerous studies of the past 30 years provide ample evidence that most Americans do not participate beyond voting in public elections.[85] Less than 10% of our citizens can be considered to be "activists." Most are occasional participants or spectators. A few are apathetics. Harris concluded a study of citizen participation by saying:

> For the most part, a majority of the American people simply have not participated in the formulation of public policies at any level of government, with the single exception of going to the polls to vote.[86]

Numerous Americans do not even perform the basic and relatively undemanding act of voting. Less than two-thirds of the adult citizen population typically vote in a presidential election. Less than one-half typically vote in congressional elections. As few as 30% vote in most strictly local elections.

About 25% of Americans over the age of 13 are involved in some kind of volunteer work in their communities. These volunteers give an average of about nine hours per week to their particular projects.[87]

Recent evidence from the National Assessment studies suggests that today's youngsters may be having more opportunity and motivation to take part in decision-making in schools. Almost 70% of both 13-year-olds and 17-year-olds reported participation in decision-making about school policies pertaining to at least two of these five areas of concern:

(1) Changes in school rules;

(2) Improvements in the buildings or grounds;

(3) Changes in courses offered;

(4) Increase in extracurricular activities; and

(5) Changes in ways decisions are made.[88]

Participation varies with socio-economic status and educational attainment. Those who occupy higher statuses are more likely to take part in civic activities. Those with more formal education are more likely to be involved.[89] Citizens in the 25-50 year-old

age group are more likely to be involved in political activities than either younger or older adults.[90]

Upper-income people with higher educational attainment are more likely than lower status citizens to work as volunteers in community groups. Citizens in the 25-50 year-old age group are more involved in volunteer work than either younger or older citizens. The most typical volunteer worker is a married, white female between ages 25-44, a college graduate and in the upper-income bracket.[91] Greater emphasis is now being placed by voluntary groups on involving all segments of society.

Citizens with more resources, such as money, skills, knowledge, have more potential for effective participation in community activities than do those with few resources. Significant impediments to participation exist in the lives of lower status citizens:

> These groups tend to have less of the social resources of leisure time, money and access to information than other groups in our society. Psychological resources also discriminate among people who tend to participate more in the political system. Those individuals who feel they can influence events, believe in the responsibility of citizenship, understand politics, and are not preoccupied with personal problems, who have considerable self-confidence, and are trusting of others, would tend to find it easier to participate.[92]

Upper-status citizens tend to have more of the material and psychological resources associated with participation in community activities. Thus, they have more opportunity to contribute to their communities and to benefit, both educationally and materially, from their involvement.

Following is a discussion of some current programs which provide participation experiences for citizens.

Illustrative Programs

Citizen participation can take many forms. It may involve efforts to influence a political decision facing an administrative or legislative official. But it can also take the form of activity designed to improve the community or to alleviate a social problem. Some examples of the wide range of participation experiences available follow.

Schools

Too often citizen education programs in schools are limited to teaching students about civic and community life while withholding opportunities to participate in it. Citizen participation requires practice and experience. To the extent possible, opportunities for participation should begin with youth before they reach adulthood.

The school itself can provide an arena for citizen participation. Hanover High School in Hanover, New Hampshire has a legislative council elected by students and faculty. The council is served by a salaried executive director chosen by the council. The council has authority to make decisions on all matters affecting student and faculty life not otherwise controlled by state or local education policy. To date, the council's concern has ranged broadly over such topics as graduation requirements, student lounge, a school store run by students, and discrimination in the athletics program. While the principal can veto an action of the council, his veto can be overridden by a two-third's majority.

The Center for City Building Educational Programs in Los Angeles, California, has developed an integrated learning system adaptable to all levels of education which focuses on invention, self-discovery and expression, and on learning about the relationship of self to objects, organizations, and the environment. City Building programs are designed to help students become productive, independent, and thoughtful citizens in a complex, uncertain, and rapidly changing world.

In each city-building program, the classroom becomes an analogue of the city, in which issues of the larger environment are explored through classroom experience. Classroom governance becomes analogous to city governance, the use of city space is explored through manipulation of classroom space. Architects, planners, scientists, and other professionals come into the classroom where they collaborate with students and teachers in conceiving and designing a city or society of the future.

The National Commission on Resources for Youth was established in 1967 to foster opportunities for youth to assume responsible and socially useful roles in their schools and communities. Founded at a time when few youth participation programs existed, the National Commission established two programs as demonstration projects: Youth Tutoring Youth and Youth Helper in Day Care. More recently the National Commission has concentrated on identifying

outstanding programs underway in communities and schools across the nation and, through its newsletter, bringing these programs to the attention of its readers.

The Institute for Responsive Education is also concerned with citizen participation and schools. The Institute was established in 1973 to support and encourage public participation in educational decision-making. It strives to further collaboration between school patrons and school professionals in educational planning and decision-making. Two projects have been recently launched by the Institute. One, the Factual Politics Project , has produced materials to help community people gather information on important community problems. The second focuses on collective bargaining in the public schools. The Institute also attempts to disseminate information about various ways in which lay people can participate more actively in school decision making.

Religious Institutions

Religious organizations provide many participation opportunities for young and old alike. Church Women United (CWU) in the USA is a national movement of Protestant, Roman Catholic and Orthodox women who undertake campaigns aimed at alleviating social problems it deems of serious magnitude. One activity is a Hunger Fund. In one year, funds were raised for various projects, including drought relief for Ethiopia, emergency food aid for Indochina, and food for Indians in Minnesota. In addition, members were asked to decrease their own demands on food and energy in order to increase the supply for others.

CWU is also active in the political life of the country. It organizes campaigns on behalf of legislation it favors; it buys shares in corporations, then attends stockholder meetings so that it can query managers on some of the corporations' social policies; and it publicizes issues that are coming before Congress and the Executive branch, urging its followers to send telegrams and letters.

The Commission on Voluntary Service and Action is a group of voluntary agencies placing volunteers whose goal is to maintain and expand the opportunities for individuals to donate time to worthwhile causes. CVSA began in 1945 as a coordinating group for church agencies establishing work camps to help rebuild war-ravaged Europe. Its scope of activity has grown since that time to include efforts both abroad and in the United States to help citizens make contributions to alleviate economic and social problems.

CVSA publishes a catalog entitled Invest Yourself. This publication lists situations available throughout the world where volunteer help is needed. Information about how to become an active participant in the program as well as a frank discussion of the qualities needed in a good participant are also a part of this publication.

Business

The Clearinghouse on Corporate Social Responsibility reported that in 1975 in the life and health insurance business, 169 companies released 6,000 employees during normal business hours to do almost 166,000 hours of volunteer work. A number of companies had formal policies allowing employees a certain number of fully paid days off for community involvement.[93]

The Xerox Corporation's program of allowing employees one-year leaves for community projects is well-known. In a 1967 survey of over 1,000 companies, the Committee for Economic Development found that 87% of the companies encouraged employee participation in community service organizations and 75% encouraged employee service on public boards and commissions.[94]

Labor

Labor unions have a long history of community service not only in aiding workers' families, but in encouraging citizen participation in community affairs.

Because barbers and beauticians hear so many of their clients' problems, their union in Indiana trains them to be knowledgeable about the services, locations, and eligibility requirements of community agencies.

The AFL-CIO is also active in crime prevention and control. One project, Education to Action, involves local union members working with juvenile authorities to provide youth rehabilitation.

Voluntary Associations

Although much voluntary activity is individual and done in isolation, the programs here are representative of the ever-growing voluntary organizations involving citizens in problem-solving.

The Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) was founded in Arkansas in 1970; it how has regional offices in South Dakota, Texas, Louisiana, Tennessee, Missouri, and Florida. Its purpose is to organize low-income families

to work in their neighborhoods, cities, and towns on issues they deem important. ACORN has organized campaigns on a variety of neighborhood issues such as drainage improvements, street lights, etc., and on more general topics such as utility reform and environmental pollution.

A central purpose of ACORN is to increase citizen participation. This often means increasing political awareness on the part of citizens, increasing their sense of political efficacy, and teaching political skills. The desired result is not only a decision that is favorable to ACORN clients but also a greater capacity for political action on the part of low-income people.

Common Cause may be the best known voluntary association for citizen action today. Founded in 1970 by John Gardner, it has quickly become a hard-hitting national lobby representing the public at large. As compared to special interest groups that represent a particular faction of society, e.g., farmers, truck drivers, oil pipeline owners, Common Cause attempts to represent the broad public interest. It has campaigned for election reforms and changes in the seniority system in Congress; it opposed the War in Vietnam and favored programs to improve health delivery systems.

But voluntary associations need not be large in order to be effective or to do important work. The Purchase Area Fellowship Program consists of a group of volunteers from ten counties adjacent to the Kentucky State Prison at Eddyville. These volunteers consist of men and women, laborers, businessmen, and ministers, those who have regular jobs and others who are retired. Nearly all go the prison at least one day each week; some travel to Eddyville as much as three days each week. The volunteers go to listen, to counsel, and to teach; in whatever way they can, they help men confined to the prison.

Haven of Northern Virginia, Inc., is a volunteer-staffed charitable organization devoted to helping people face life-threatening illness. Through its work in the community, Haven also is working to develop an informed consciousness of the needs of the dying. In 1977, Haven received a National Volunteer Activist Award for its creative approach to a community problem.

Government

"No taxation without representation" was a slogan that had great meaning to Americans two hundred years ago. Today, the slogan

might read, "No regulation without representation", for increasingly Americans are seeking ways to participate in the decisions made by executive and legislative agencies that affect their lives. Electing "Smiths" and sending them to Washington is no longer enough. Increasingly, people want to follow the activities of their legislators and make certain that they represent them in the way they feel is appropriate.

While there is an American tradition of providing for citizen participation in government (the New England Town meeting remains a spendid example), the most recent emphasis upon finding routes for more people to influence government decisions can be traced to the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964. This act, which established and supported Community Action Programs (CAP), called for the "maximum feasible participation" of the poor. Community Action Agencies were established in hundreds of communities across the nation. Each local agency was directed by a board on which the poor, business and other organized aspects of the community, and the government shared equally in decision-making aspects of the program. This model permitted Federal funds to go directly to Community Action Agencies, bypassing local government.

The Model Cities Program, authorized by the Demonstration City and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, also stipulated that to become eligible for Federal assistance a Model Cities Program must show "widespread citizen participation in the program." However, Model Cities differed from CAP in that final decisions rested with local governmental authorities, a response to criticism by local government officials who were unhappy because CAP's could bypass them.

The effect of these and other efforts has been to stimulate a great number and variety of groups aimed at influencing government decisions at the local level. As we have seen, some of these groups are mandated by government, many others, however, are private. Advisory Boards, policy boards, interest groups to lobby for programs, cooperatives, and organizations of organizations have sprung up around the general desire to find routes by which the recipients of services can have greater control over how these services are administered. Two examples are the Philadelphia Welfare Rights Organization and the 44th Ward Assembly.

The Philadelphia Welfare Rights Organization (WRO) is composed entirely of welfare recipients. It is dedicated to making certain that persons who need and merit public assistance receive it, that welfare services are provided with dignity, and that welfare grants provide for at least the minimum essentials of life. Beyond this primary purpose, WRO has undertaken a number

of parallel programs. For example, it helps locate jobs for welfare recipients; it has provided sensitivity training for case workers; and it has received funds to train community visiting nurses.

The 44th Ward Assembly exists to strengthen citizen participation in the 44th Ward in Chicago. The Assembly has two kinds of members: voting and non-voting. A non-voting member is any citizen in the ward and may speak at the Assembly but not vote. Voting members are elected representatives. The alderman from the 44th Ward, who is the chairperson of the meeting, cannot vote but is expected to be bound by decisions reached through public debate at the monthly meetings.

The demand for these and other kinds of citizen participation activities seems likely to grow rather than lessen. One problem has been to find ways for citizens to influence state and Federal agencies in ways that are currently available for them to reach local agencies. Evidence that the government is attempting to respond to these pressures can be found in the sunshine laws, in the passage of freedom of information statutes, in requests for citizen advice during periods when new regulations are being developed, and in some isolated instances in which agencies such as the Federal Trade Commission pay the expenses incurred when representatives of citizens groups testify at its hearings. A 1973 Louis Harris survey reported that 48% of the respondents said they believed that government could be improved by placing "tight checks" on it. This seems to be occuring.

SUMMARY

A minority of citizens have the knowledge, thinking skills, participation skills, and attitudes necessary for effective participation in civic affairs. Most of these citizens hold the more privileged positions in our society; those with higher levels of educational attainment and socio-economic status are more likely than others to have knowledge, skills, and attitudes associated with competent performance of citizen tasks. It is an "irony of democracy" that an elite minority rather than the masses seem to be the primary bearers of the responsibilities of citizenship. However, in comparison to citizens of other democracies around the world, Americans tend to rank high in tests of political knowledge and democratic attitudes.[95]

Youngsters who belong to higher status families tend to receive higher quality schooling than those from lower status households. They tend to have richer out-of-school civic education ex-

periences in the home and in community organizations. Research also indicates that those who have attained higher levels of education and socio-economic status tend to make more effective use of the mass media to obtain knowledge associated with effective citizenship. In short, those who have higher socio-economic statuses tend to have more access to high quality civic education both within and outside of school.

There are notable exceptions to the preceding generalizations. Labor unions strive to provide political education for members, which undoubtedly contributes to an increase in the citizenship competencies of working class people. Voluntary associations provide training in effective civic action for poor people. The federal government has tried to increase the civic competencies of low-income citizens through Community Action Programs, and so forth. However, it remains true that higher status citizens (not the masses) are more likely to be plugged-in to various organizational networks which provide opportunities to articulate interests to key public policy makers and to the acquisition, use and refinement of civic competencies.

Most citizens tend to know the value of law and order, to respect legitimate authorities, and to express basic loyalty to their country and political system. Extremists of the "left" and the "right" win scant support from the majority, particularly from working class citizens. Lessons about the need to obey the law have been learned rather well by the masses of citizens. However, in a society with democratic ideals, there ought to be more to responsible citizenship than passive acceptance of duly constituted authority. In a democracy, responsible citizenship entails both obedience and constructive skepticism; it involves both respect for authority and constructive criticism of authorities; it requires citizens who are both compliant and independent, who will demonstrate obedience to the law while retaining a spirit of constructive criticism and reasonable dissent.

Civic educators, in schools and in other sectors of society, have a right to be concerned about developing responsible citizenship on a larger scale than exists currently in our country. In particular, they should be concerned about how to foster a more extensive and equitable distribution among various groups of citizens, of knowledge, skills, and attitudes associated with effective participation in civic life.

Various groups, in different sectors of society, contribute significantly to citizen education. However, these efforts are often haphazard. There is a lack of communication and coordination between civic educators in different sectors.

The kinds of learning emphasized in different citizen education programs are often uneven and disjointed. Some programs, especially those conducted in schools, stress mostly formal learning of knowledge and thinking skills. However, this formal learning is rarely applied to real problems in the world outside the school. In contrast, other programs emphasize learning-by-doing through participation experiences in the community. However, participants may bring little knowledge or academic skills to their tasks, and they may lack the intellectual tools necessary to derive meaning from their experience.

Citizen education is most powerful when formal school-based kinds of learning are interlaced with participation experiences in various non-school settings. A continuing challenge of civic educators is to design programs which will coordinate more effectively different kinds of learning activities and experiences involving different sectors of society.

FOOTNOTES

1. Hazel Gaudet Erskine, "The Polls: The Informed Public, Public Opinion Quarterly, Winter, 1962, 26, pp. 668-677.

2. Norval D. Glenn, "The Distribution of Political Knowledge in the United States, "in Dan D. Nimmo and Charles M. Bonjean (eds.), Political Attitudes and Public Opinion, New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1972, p. 273.

3. David Easton and Jack Dennis, Children in the Political System, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969, pp. 73-285.

4. June L. Tapp, " A Child's Garden of Law and Order, "Psychology Today, 1970, 4, pp. 29-31.

5. Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney, The Development of Political Attitudes in Children, Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967, pp. 32-59; National Assessment of Educational Progress, Political Knowledge and Attitudes, Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1973, pp. 45-46.

6. National Assessment of Educational Progress, Education for Citizenship, Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1976, p. 21.

7. Ibid., pp. 21-30.

8. Ibid., pp. 26-27.

9. John J. Patrick, "The Impact of an Experimental Course 'American Political Behavior,' on the Knowledge, Skills, and Attitudes of Secondary School Students," Social Education, February 1972, 36, pp. 168-179.

10. Louis Harris, The Anguish of Change, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1973, pp. 72-78.

11. Ibid., p. 77.

12. W.L. Hansen, "The State of Economic Literacy," in D.R. Wentworth, et. al. (eds.), Perspectives on Economic Education, Joint Council on Economic Education, 1976.

13. Howard Flieger, "The Economics Gap, "U.S. News & World Report, January 31, 1977, p. 76.

14. Charles E. Walker, "Mother Hubbard's Cupboard, " The Lamp, Winter 1974.

15. Glenn S. Dumke, "A New Dimension to Economic Education A Nation of Economic Illiterates, "Vital Speeches of the Day, September 15, 1976, 42, p. 1.

16. M.L. Frankel, "Economic Education: A National Crisis, " A Speech presented to the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, 1974.

17. Walker, op. cit.

18. Edward B. Fiske, "History Means Little to 'Now' Generation, "New York Times, May 9, 1976, p. 16.

19. Edward B. Fiske, "Times Test of College Freshmen Shows Knowledge of American History Limited, "New York Times, May 2, 1976, pp. 1, 65.

20. Jonathan Friendly, "Scores Followed Normal Curve," New York Times, May 4, 1976.

21. Fiske, op. cit.

22. Ibid.

23. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., "Do we Care About Our History?" The Wall Street Journal, July 1, 1976, p. 10.

24. Richard C. Remy, et. al., International Learning and International Education in a Global Age, Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1975, pp. 5-43.

25. Barry K. Beyer and E.P. Hicks, Images of Africa, Pittsburgh: Carnegie-Mellon University, 1968 (mimeographed).

26. Don D. Smith "Dark Areas of Ignorance Revisited: Current Knowledge About Asian Affairs, " in Dan D. Nimmo and Charles M. Bonjean (eds.), Political Attitudes and Public Opinion, New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1972, pp. 267-272.

27. J. V. Torney. "The International Orientations and Knowledge of Adolescents in Nine Countries: the IEA Civic Education Survey." International Journal of Political Education, in press.

28. Smith, op. cit.

29. James C. Davies, "The Family's Role in Political Socialization," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September, 1965, 361, pp. 10-19.

30. Richard E. Dawson, Kenneth Prewitt, and Karen S. Dawson, Political Socialization, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1977, pp. 117-118.

31. National Assessment; Fiske; Harris; op. cit.

32. John D. Haas, The Era of the New Social Studies, Boulder, Colorado: Social Science Education Consortium 1977; Dale L. Brubaker, Alternative Directions for the Social Studies, Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Company, 1967,

33. Dawson, Prewitt, Dawson, op. cit., pp. 165-168.

34. Dennis J. Weidenaar, et. al., Economics in Social Studies Textbooks, Joint Council on Economic Education, 1973.

35. American Political Science Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education, "Political Education in the Public Schools: The Challenge for Political Science," PS Newsletter of the American Political Science Association, Summer 1971, 4, pp. 1-27.

36. C. Benjamin Cox, "American History: Chronology and the Inquiry Process"; John R. Palmer, "American History: Potential for Inquiry But Little Fulfillment"; and Jack E. Cousins, "State History"; These three chapters appear in C. Benjamin Cox and Byron J. Massialas (eds.), Social Studies in the United States: A Critical Appraisal, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1967.

37. Dumke, op. cit., p. 2.

38. Frankel, op. cit.

39. R.S. Kirkendall, "The Status of History in the Schools," Journal of American History, September 1975, 62, pp. 557-570.

40. A.M. Rubin, "Television in Children's Political Socialization," Journal of Broadcasting, Winter 1976, 20, pp. 51-59.

41. J.R. Dominick, "Television and Political Socialization," Educational Broadcasting Review, 1972, 6, pp. 48-56.

42. Remy, et. al., op. cit., p. 37.

43. R.H. Prisuta, "Mass Media Exposure and Political Behavior," Educational Broadcasting Review, June 1973, 7, pp. 167-173.

44. Ibid., p. 172.

45. D. Vinyard and R.S. Sigel, "Newspapers and Urban Voters," Journalism Quarterly, Autumn 1971, 48, pp. 488-493.

46. Beyer and Hicks, op. cit., p. 165.

47. Gerald S. Lesser, Children and Television, New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1974.

48. June L. Tapp and Lawrence Kohlberg, "Developing Senses of Law and Legal Justice," The Journal of Social Issues, 1971, 27, pp. 86-91.

49. Lawrence Kohlberg and Alan Lockwood, Cognitive-Developmental Psychology and Political Education, 1974 (mimeographed).

50. National Assessment, 1973, op. cit., pp. 45-46, 59-63.

51. Joseph Adelson, "The Political Imagination of the Young Adolescent," Daedalus, 1971, 100, pp. 1013-1050.

52. Joseph Adelson and Robert P. O'Neill, "Growth of Political Ideas in Adolescence: The Sense of Community," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, pp. 295-306.

53. Ibid., p. 306.

54. National Education Association, Educational Policies Commission, The Central Purpose of American Education, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association of the United States, 1961, p. 6.

55. Dawson, Prewitt, and Dawson, op. cit., p. 166.

56. Edgar Litt, "Civic Education, Community Norms, and Political Indoctrination." American Sociological Review, 1963, 28, pp. 69-75.

57. Ibid., p. 74.

58. Robert M. Gagne and L.J. Briggs, Principles of Instructional Design, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1974, p. 62.

59. National Assessment, 1976, op. cit., p. 15.

60. Samuel A. Stouffer, Communism, Conformity and Civil Liberties, Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company., Inc. 1955; J.W. Prothro and C.M. Grigg, "Fundamental Principles of Democracy: Bases of Agreement and Disagreement," Journal of Politics, 1960, 22, pp. 276-294; G.L. Zellman and D.O. Sears, "Childhood Origins of Tolerance for Dissent," Journal of Social Issues, 1971, 27, pp. 109-136; Louis Harris, The Anguish of Change, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1973.

61. Zellman and Sears, op. cit.

62. National Assessment, 1970, op. cit., pp. 35-36.

63. Harris, 1973, op. cit., pp. 276-282.

64. National Assessment, 1976, op. cit., pp. 12-13.

65. Remy, et. al., op. cit., pp. 12-13.

66. Gustav Jahoda, "Children's Concepts of Nationality," Child Development, 1964, 35, pp. 1081-1092.

67. Wallace E. Lambert and Otto Klineberg, Children's Views of Foreign Peoples, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967, pp. 223-224.

68. Ibid.

69. Hess and Torney, op. cit.; Remy, et. al., op. cit., pp. 5-43; Torney and Morris, op. cit., pp. 8-22.

70. Harris, op. cit., 1974, pp. 24-69.

71. National Assessment, 1970, op. cit., p. 37.

72. Daniel Yankelovich, The New Morality: A Profile of American Youth in the 70's, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974.

73. Adelson and O'Neill, op. cit.

74. Ibid.

75. Yankelovich, op. cit.

76. National Assessment, 1970, op. cit., pp. 22-24.

77. Herbert Hyman, Political Socialization, New York: The Free Press, 1958; Lester Milbrath, Political Participation, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1965; Sidney Verba and Norma Nie, Participation in America, New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1972.

78. Sam Long and Mary Strong, "The Political System as Youth Sees It, "Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1976, 58, pp. 208-209.

79. Louis Harris, 1974, op. cit.

80. R.M. Liebert and R.W. Poulos, "TV for Kiddies: Truth, Goodness, Beauty and a Little Bit of Brainwash," Psychology Today, November 1972, p. 123.

81. Albert Bandura, "Social Learning Theory of Identification Processes," in D.A. Goslin (ed.), Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research, Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1971, p. 214.

82. Lesser, op. cit., p. 23.

83. Thomas R. Dye and L. Harmon Ziegler, The Irony of Democracy, North Scituate, Massachusetts: Duxbury Press, 1975.

84. Verba and Nie, op. cit.

85. Julian Woodward and Elmo Roper, "Political Activity of American Citizens," American Political Science Review, December, 1950, 44, pp. 872-885; Angus Campbell, et. al., The American Voter, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1960; Milbrath, op. cit.; Verba and Nie, op. cit.; Harris, op. cit.

86. Harris, op. cit., p. 101.

87. U.S. Census Bureau, Americans Volunteer, Washington, DC: ACTION, 1974, pp. 1-3.

88. National Assessment, 1976, op. cit., pp. 19-20

89. Verba and Nie, op. cit.; Milbrath, op. cit.

90. Dawson, Prewitt, Dawson, op. cit., p. 84.

91. U.S. Census Bureau, op. cit., p. 3.

92. Dawson, Prewitt, Dawson, op. cit., p. 111.

93. Clearinghouse on Corporate Social Responsibilities, "Social Reporting Program of the Life and Health Insurance Business," 1976, New York.

94. Committee for Economic Development, "Social Responsibilities of Business Corporations," New York. June, 1971. p. 41.

95. Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton Univerity Press, 1963.

CHAPTER III

PART A: RECOMMENDATIONS WITH COMMENTARY

PART B: SUMMARY OF SELECTED RESEARCH

Steve McCurley and Judith Torney

CHAPTER III

INTRODUCTION

The following set of Recommendations is presented to stimulate discussion and action in a wide range of areas relating to citizen education and participation. It should be understood at the outset that the Recommendations do not in all cases represent the views of the authors of this report. Rather, the Recommendations represent the viewpoints and opinions of a wide range of participants who were asked to submit suggestions concerning citizen education and participation in America. From these suggestions, and from other sources, the recommendations given below were selected to provide examples of a variety of possibilities for citizen education.

The Recommendations presented in this report were obtained from the following sources:

1. Survey of the literature on citizen education and participation;

2. Review of recommendations included in similar reports such as the National Panel on High School and Adolescent Education, Task Force on Urban Education, White House Conference on Youth, and the National Congress on Volunteerism and Citizenship;

3. Letters of solicitation sent broadly to those in the educational field and in other sectors; (see Appendix B)

4. Recommendations from members of the Task Force; (See Appendix D)

5. Individual discussions and group meetings held in Boston and Washington;

6. Study of the Delphi results of the Office of Education Kansas City Conference on Citizen Education; and

7. Meetings at the Education Week Conference sponsored by the National Council on the Social Studies at Chautauqua, New York.

The broad suggestions obtained through these sources were reviewed and distilled into the forms below.

The Recommendations are presented in a format which is designed for a policy-maker with general knowledge in the areas under consideration. The recommendations are divided into seven categories: Conceptual Framework, Primary Groups, Schools, Work, Voluntary Associations, Mass Media, and Government. Each of these categories is followed by a section of commentary which further explains the substance of the Recommendations.

The research summary, Part II, while illustrative and not definitive, should provide additional information of assistance to those desirous of examining the evidence behind some of the Recommendations.

Recommendations Part A

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

I. A National Commission on Citizen Education and Involvement should be convened to develop a framework and goals for citizen education in the United States. Membership in the Commission should include representation from all sectors of American society.

   A. Special attention should be given to those areas of citizen education which have been particularly deficient among students and adults, such as comprehension of the American political and economic systems.

   B. Emphasis should also be placed on methods for increasing understanding of national policies and priorities.

   C. Criteria for evaluating citizen education and involvement programs should be developed which include use of all sectors of society, recognition of the life-long process of citizen education, the need for an integrative approach, and a balance between parochial and cosmopolitan perspectives.

II. Local communities should convene similar commissions to consider applicable community frameworks and goals.

III. Federal research and development policy should contain incentives to involve the research community in investigating and clarifying the framework, goals, and evaluation criteria.

Commentary

The National Commission envisioned by these Recommendations is not intended to produce definitive guidelines in identifying, defining, or creating the "correct" approach to citizen education and participation in the United States. Such a monolithic framework would not be consonant either with the breadth of participatory experience in this country or with the needs of a pluralistic society. A need does exist, however, for some comprehensive and

integrated statements in this area which can serve as points of debate and choice.

The following general purposes are suggested for the Commission:

- To examine the assumptions and goals of citizen education and participation -

Quite often, current programs seem to operate on the basis of outmoded or incorrect justifications, or without any clear rationale at all. Newmann, for example, concludes his discussion of developing a rationale for civic education by pointing to the naivety of the assumption that it is possible to teach all important knowledge, and the absurdity of choosing educational topics on the basis of their interest to a particular teacher.[1] Yet these are principles of choice used widely in civic education today. Mogoluf, in reviewing federal efforts at citizen participation in the 1960's, concluded:

> ...we are impressed with the great confusion and ambiguity existing amongst Federal officials around the concept of participation. Few personnel seem aware of the range of options covered by the idea of participation. Few agencies have any working definition as to what participation ought to involve.[2]

A systematic effort should be initiated to examine potential frameworks of participation and education.

- To involve all sectors of society in this examination -

It is crucial to the success of the Commission that it include all sectors of American society in the examination of goals and assumptions. All too often, past approaches have been fragmented and one-sided. A National Commission should have representation from all sectors - government, business and labor, educational institutions, voluntary associations, etc., and from all classes and backgrounds of citizens. Only with this wide-ranging representation will maximum citizen involvement be achieved.

- To concentrate on identified areas of deficiency -

As Mehlinger and Patrick have indicated in Chapter II, surveys have consistently found areas of massive ignorance and misinformation among the American public concerning their own political system and institutions. Special attention should be given by the Commission to means of remedying these identified deficiencies.

- To increase understanding of national goals and priorities -

It should be recognized that citizen education and participation are not simply theoretical concerns, but can bear directly on the questions and issues that face American society today. Methods need to be identified which relate our educational and participatory programs to these issues. Greater discussion and understanding of the problems will increase the likelihood of citizen participation in their solutions. Citizens are more likely to care about a problem that affects them directly and are more apt to act to remedy that problem. Young people or adults who understand national energy problems, for example, are more likely to exercise self-restraint in consumption and more likely to join with others in seeking community and regional solutions to energy problems.

- To recognize certain key criteria -

Until relatively recently, American educational institutions tended to view themselves as an isolated instructional unit dealing with children, adolescents and young adults. Society, however, is composed of many other units (business, government, etc.), all of which have an 'educational' impact on citizens of all ages. The concept of life-long education has reached the stage of theoretical acceptance, but not the level of complete implementation. Citizen education must operate as a life-long approach communicated by all sectors with which the citizen has contact and integrated with other courses of study and education. Since one is a citizen throughout one's life and within a variety of institutional and societal settings, we must approach education and participation with all of these settings in mind.

In short, the National Commission is intended to examine all aspects of citizen education and participation, to review assumptions and suggest goals, to identify workable procedures where possible, and to identify areas requiring discussion and further study.

As noted above, the members of this Task Force do not believe that a single approach or definition can be provided in this area. The goals and procedures which result from the National Commission on Citizen Education and Involvement will need to be examined in turn by local communities. Community residents will need to adapt or alter the suggested approaches according to local characteristics and/or philosophies. The 'best' approach to citizen education and participation may thus vary from community to community, as

local commissions establish local priorities and goals.

The ability of community residents to perform quite complex policy examinations of this type has been demonstrated in the recent activities of metropolitan goals programs such as those in Dallas and New Orleans, which involved thousands of area residents in planning activities.[3] Similar groups have operated successfully at both the community and state level.[4]

In addition to serving as a means of identifying a community approach, local commissions offer a desirable means of involving citizens in implementation of community programs. Those citizens working to formulate initial policies are more likely to continue their participation, since their input has provided them with a stake in the successful outcome of the project.

Both the national and local commissions can serve to identify those areas in which additional research and development is necessary. Some current areas where efforts might be directed are:

1. A continuing examination of the status of citizen attitudes, skills, participation, and experience (perhaps through a continuation of the National Assessment);

2. A definition of the relationship between popular culture (as expressed in radio, TV, and comics) and pro- and anti-social attitudes;

3. An identification of the ability of school systems to integrate and synthesize experimental teaching materials with current curricula.

Another area in need of further research is that of the best sequential framework for providing citizen education and participation training.

FOOTNOTES

1. F. Newmann, "Building a Rationale for Civic Education," Paper presented at the National Council for the Social Studies, Indianapolis, March 1976 (revised February 1977).

2. M. Mogoluf, Citizen Participation: A Review and Commentary on Federal Policies and Practices, Washington, DC: Urban Institute, 1970.

3. See J. R. Bobo, "Metropolitan Goals Programs: A Model and Evaluation of the Dallas and New Orleans Program," Town Planning Review, 1976, 47, pp. 43-55.

4. K. Bea and C. Huston, Citizen Futures Organizations: Group Profiles, Washington, DC: Library of Congress, Legislative Research Service, 1976.

PRIMARY GROUPS

I. Programs should be established to educate and prepare adolescents and young adults for the responsibilities of child rearing. Special attention should be given to those areas closely related to establishing pro-social behavior and sense of competence.

II. Local communities and neighborhoods should be organized to provide the collective support to child-rearing, family stability, and family involvement that the extended family used to provide in previous generations. All community-based institutions - religious groups, schools, business, etc.- should evaluate their impact upon the stability of the family.

II. Systems of surrogate family relationships, such as Big Brothers and Big Sisters, should be encouraged and expanded.

IV. Family members should be encouraged to participate, both as individuals and as a unit, in institutions and groups which affect them.

Commentary

Remy, in Chapter I, has provided us with some background information on the importance of primary groups to citizen education. Further information is given in the section of the Summary of Selected Research devoted to Parent Education.

Given the importance of family associations in attitude formation, it is crucial that we seek to utilize all our resources to aid parents in teaching their children the value, rights & responsibility of good citizenship. One method of accomplishing this is to establish parent education courses which provide information and instruction on teaching citizenship.[1] The courses should be available to adolescents and young adults, also, to provide early instruction in the responsibilities of child-rearing. Community-based institutions can provide, or add to, this instruction through programs of their own. In addition, community programs should be reviewed for possible disruptive effects upon the family.

Surrogate family relationships are important for those children outside of the traditional family structure. Programs such as Big

Brothers and Big Sisters are important because they provide role models and community experience for children. They also provide beneficial involvement for adults.

Finally, family members should encourage participation, both individually and as a group. Participatory attitudes and skills are easier to acquire when one has models to follow and home-instruction. Family participation fulfills both of these functions.

FOONOTE

1. Summary of Selected Research, Parent Education.

SCHOOLS

I. Since schools represent a primary skill acquisition area for citizen education and participation, they should be organized to maximize such training.

A. Schools should create the maximum number of opportunities for students to participate in school governance, and in appropriate academic decisions which affect them personally.

B. School districts should consider reorganization or reduction in the size of junior high and secondary schools to give students more opportunities for participation.

C. Extra-curricular programs which give students opportunities in meaningful participation should be reinstated in those schools where they have been eliminated. Where financial considerations preclude this, volunteer leadership from adults outside of the school system should be sought.

II. The curriculum of the schools should place special emphasis on citizen education and participation.

A. Students should be taught to analyze social behavior, values, and political issues as presented by the media.

B. Materials and methods concerning citizen education and participation should be developed for students and adults from those specialized populations (the urban and rural poor, the non-English speaking, and the non-literate) which have traditionally been less involved.

C. School districts should continue to adopt improved guidelines for selection of textbooks which include consideration of the following:

1. presentation of models of effective citizen participation for both men and women;

2. material to enhance skills of issue analysis and advocacy;

3. presentation of the realities as well as the ideals of American society;

4. materials to enhance understanding of the global perspectives; and

5. indications of the contribution of ethnic groups to American life.

D. A system of educational credits for voluntary community involvement should be developed and utilized by educational institutions.

III. Programs for educational personnel (including both teachers and administrators) should be developed to enhance their abilities both as models for and teachers of citizen education and participation.

A. Educational personnel should be trained to:

1. better serve as models of appropriate and responsible social behavior;

2. become more aware of "class climate" and more responsive to student expression of ideas; and

3. become more effective in aiding students to make and reason about moral and ethical decisions.

B. Teacher training programs should be conducted in those areas of citizen education in which curriculum development in recent years has been especially rapid, such as:

1. skills of issue analysis and advocacy;

2. use of field work participation as part of class requirements;

3. law-related education;

4. moral education;

5. global education;

6. economics education; and

7. ethnic and cultural heritage studies.

This training should be provided to all teachers with the aim of integrating these methods and materials into all areas of coursework.

Commentary

The recommendations concerning schools fall into three broad categories; organizing for citizen education, planning for citizen education, and training for citizen education.

- Organizing for citizen education -

Recommendation I deals with organizing schools for citizen education. In the years since the 'hidden curriculum' was identified, a number of attempts have been made to specify the effects of school structures and rules upon social and political attitudes.[1] The American Bar Association Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship recommended that the governance of the school serve as a model for justice.

Participation in school institutions has tended to create positive attitudes toward the institution and greater satisfaction with rules and procedures.[2] Participation by students thus becomes important both in creating good-will and in acting as a training area for future community participation. Opportunities for participation such as governing councils and student advisory committees are means of facilitating this participation.

Decentralization is another method for fostering participation. Students in smaller schools tend to have more involvement experiences than children in larger schools.[3] Reduction of school size, or internal modifications which diffuse authority, can create opportunities for increased involvement.

Extra-curricular activities represent another area of participation. Traditional activities such as sports, forensics, etc. offer opportunities for involvement and training in valuable participation skills. Students may acquire management or speaking skills, and develop a sense of competence about operating programs. Volunteer adults can lessen the costs of such programs.

- Planning for citizen education -

The curriculum of the schools should also operate to maximize citizen education. Courses and materials should be designed to increase student knowledge and awareness of the importance and techniques of effective citizenship.

Courses should be designed which teach the student to analyze he events of the world around him, particularly as presented by the media.[4] The adage that one should not believe everything one reads in the papers is old, but nevertheless correct. Training in critical thinking and evaluation should be provided to assist in this evaluation.

Materials should be developed which will assist traditionally non-involved segments of the population in acquiring the techniques of participation. This may require special programs designed for the poor, the non-English speaking, and the non-literate. Given the long history of low participation by these groups, special measures may be necessary to develop patterns of involvement.

Textbook selection should serve to integrate programs of citizen education with regular courses. Criteria for text selection should include the presentation of participatory role models,[5] and the presentation of global and ethnic perspectives.[6]

Finally, the curriculum of schools should be designed to encourage and reward community involvement of students. One method for this is the use of educational credits to reward community involvement. Service-learning opportunities in community organizations provide students with valuable experiences in participation and information. Providing educational credits for this activity would increase the incentive for students to become involved. Academic credits might also be extended to those adults wishing to re-enter school. These 'life experience' credits benefit those who have acquired practical experience through participation in community groups.

- Training for citizen education -

Recommendation III deals with training educational personnel for citizen education. It is important to note that these recommended training programs are not intended to be restricted to teachers of Civics and Social Studies who are normally responsible for teaching citizen education. In keeping with the integrative approach envisioned by this report, the programs are intended for all teachers and administrators who come in contact with students, and who thus communicate attitudes about societal and political institutions.

Educational personnel should be made aware of the importance of their own roles as models of student conduct,[7] formers of "classroom climate,"[8] and teachers of moral and ethical behavior.[9] The formation of student attitudes and the creation of patterns

of behavior are strongly influenced by the conduct of educational personnel. Only if school personnel are sensitive to the importance of their own actions can they communicate constructive patterns of behavior to others.

Further training should also be provided in the substantive content of those areas of citizen education which have undergone rapid development in recent years. These include issue analysis and advocacy,[10] global education,[11] law and economics education,[12] moral and ethnic education, [13] and use of field work.[14] This training should be provided to all teachers to integrate these methods and materials into other areas of coursework.

FOOTNOTES

1. Summary of Selected Research, Size of Institutions and Classroom Climate.

2. Summary of Selected Research, Effects of Participation in Schools and Other Settings.

3. Summary of Selected Research, Size of Institutions and Classroom Climate.

4. Summary of Selected Research, Mass Media; and Mehlinger and Patrick, Chapter II.

5. Summary of Selected Research, Modeling, Pro-Social Behavior, and Aggression.

6. Summary of Selected Research, Global Development Education, Ethnic and Heritage Studies, Perspective Taking, Moral Development Education, Self-Esteem and Sense of Political Competence.

7. Summary of Selected Research, Modeling, Pro-Social Behavior, and Aggression.

8. Summary of Selected Research, Size and Institutions and Classroom Climate.

9. Summary of Selected Research, Moral Development Education

10. Mehlinger and Patrick, Chapter II.

11. Summary of Selected Research, Global Development Education.

12. Mehlinger and Patrick, Chapter II.

13. Summary of Selected Research, Ethnic Heritage Studies.

WORK

I. Business and labor should recognize their responsibility to support programs of citizen education and involvement by expanding existing programs and initiating new programs.

II. Business and labor organizations should explore and consider the possibilities for expanding employee and citizen participation in organizational decision-making.

III. Employers should establish programs of work-release time and in-house referral services for employees at all levels who wish to volunteer for community activities.

IV. Employers should increase their sensitivity to changes in the patterns of society, and should explore the use of expanded flex-time and part-time employment, and the provision of in-house day care facilities.

V. Employers should consider volunteer community work in the applications of prospective employees.

Commentary

The workplace constitutes a sector of primary importance to most adults. It occupies much of their time and energies, structures many of their peer relationships, and is often the institutional setting with which they are most concerned and most familiar. As such, its importance to citizen involvement can hardly be overstated.

Much as 'classroom climate' affects students, so does the working environment affect employees. The institutional patterns of authority are 'taught' to employees just as students learn from the decision-making patterns of their schools. When employees are allowed to participate more in company-related decision-making, they acquire a more participatory impression of their environment.[1] The National Center for Productivity and Quality of Working Life reports over 180 companies with labor-management committees that actively participate in company planning. One committee in Jamestown, New York, recently participated in designing a new plant for the company, with more than 150 employee ideas being incorporated in the plant design.[2]

Business and labor can also assist in citizen education and involvement by sponsoring programs in this area.[3] Work release programs such as those now sponsored by Xerox and Pfizer, allow employees to donate their time and skill to community programs while still being paid by their employers. In-house referral programs, such as that presently underway in Wichita, Kansas are another method through which companies can encourage participation in community organizations. Through these, employees can be sent to local groups which are in need of donated services.

Employers can also encourage community involvement by recognizing volunteer community experience on resumes. Where equivalent skills are demonstrated, volunteer experience should receive the same credit as paid work experience. This measure would be especially helpful to young people just entering the job market and to women seeking paid employment after an absence or for the first time.

Employers should also recognize their obligation to respond to changes in societal patterns. Recent years have witnessed an increase in the number of working parents in need of child-care facilities. Over 46% of those children under age 18 had mothers in the work force in 1976, up from 39% in 1970. Among pre-school children, the percentage rose from 29% to 37% in the same period. Practices such as flex-time and part-time employment facilitate both this working experience and the parent supervision necessary for child rearing and development. Day care centers for employees are another method of meeting this obligation toward general support for the family.

FOOTNOTES

1. K. O. Alexander, "Issues in Job Enlargement, Job Enrichment, Worker Participation, and Shared Authority," American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 1975, 34, pp. 45-54.

2. "Plant's Employees Held in Remodeling," New York Times, August 21, 1977.

3. See Mehlinger and Patrick, Chapter II of this report for other examples.

VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS

I. Voluntary associations should undertake a concerted effort to extend participation to all segments of the community, with particular emphasis on increasing involvement from groups such as the poor, minorities, the very young, and the aged.

II. Voluntary associations should educate their membership and constituency about the value and benefits of participation both to the individual and to the community.

Commentary

Voluntary associations perform a vital role in socializing and informing citizens about our political and cultural institutions. Berger and Neuhaus note:

> At least since deTocqueville the importance of voluntary associations in American democracy has been widely recognized. Voluntarism has flourished in America more than in any other Western society... Associations create statutes, elect officers, debate, vote courses of action, and otherwise serve as schools for democracy. However trivial, wrongheaded, or bizarre we may think the purpose of some associations to be, they nonetheless perform this vital function.[1]

In addition to this educational function, many voluntary associations perform a vital role in delivery of community service. A 1974 Census Study found that over 37 million Americans donated an average of nine hours a week to community service.[2] Wolozin has estimated the annual value of this service at over $67 billion.[3]

Voluntary activity, however, has primarily been an exercise of the middle-aged, middle-class American - over 36% of the population with incomes over $20,000 volunteers, against only 12% for those of incomes less than $4,000.[4] Over 30% of those from age 25-44 performed volunteer work as opposed to 14% of those over 65. Efforts such as the Retired Senior Volunteer Program are attempting to remedy this imbalance. Increasing efforts are also being made to involve former recipients of social services as givers of assistance, as Alcoholics Anonymous has successfully done. Many citizens who did not volunteer because they thought they had no special skills are being trained to recognize their own abilities and to learn new skills.

FOOTNOTES

1. P. Berger and R. Neuhaus, To Empower People: The Role of Mediating Structures in Public Policy, Washington: American Enterprise Institute, 1977, p. 34.

2. U.S. Census Bureau, Americans Volunteer, 1974, Washington: ACTION, 1975.

3. H. Wolozin, The Value of Volunteer Services in the United States, Washington, ACTION, 1975.

4. U.S. Census Bureau, op.cit.

MASS MEDIA

I. A coordinated national media effort should be mounted to raise awareness concerning citizen education needs and opportunities for participation.

II. Workshops should be designed for media personnel which would:

   A. Demonstrate the importance of media programs in presenting role models to young people;

   B. Stress the importance of media programs in helping individuals learn the perspectives of others and in providing models of altruistic behavior, and aid media personnel in developing new programming of this type; and

   C. Perform an analysis of the accuracy of the presentation of social roles (policemen, lawyers, doctors) by media, and aid in the development of programming which is more accurate in such portrayals.

III. Mini-newsbroadcasts for children should be continued and presented more frequently during the week.

IV. Regulations concerned with public service broadcasting should require more prime time presentations.

V. Opportunities for direct citizen access and participation in broadcasting should be increased.

Commentary

The importance of the media in molding citizen opinion has been long recognized. Chapters I and II have examined the educative function of the media. Further information is provided in the Summary of Selected Research.

The Recommendations concerning Mass Media argue that media can and should be utilized as a constructive tool for citizenship education. In addition, the media could greatly expand its coverage of the multitude of existing volunteer programs in which citizens participate in solving community problems.

Initially, the media might be used as part of a national campaign to increase awareness of citizenship needs and opportunities.

This could be accomplished through increased prime time broadcasting on issues, or perhaps a repetition of the National Citizenship Test. The American Issues Forum program operated by the National Endowment for the Humanities is another example of creative use of the media to educate the public. Children can be involved in this effort through mini-newsbroadcast programs.

The regular programming of the various media should also be reviewed for their effect upon citizen education. Media personnel should be made aware of the importance of the media in shaping attitudes.[1] This awareness should lead to a review of the role models presented by current programs, to examine their accuracy and to design new programming which can foster pro- rather than anti-social behavior.

Citizens also have a right to participate in the operation of the broadcasting system. Currently that right exists with review mechanisms operated by the Federal Communications Commission.[2] Groups such as the Citizens Communications Center have attempted to implement that right and allow citizen review and input into media systems at both the national and local level.[3] Another area which might warrant investigation is the Open Channel programs of New York City, which allow for direct use of the media by individuals and community groups.

FOOTNOTES

1. Summary of Selected Research, Mass Media, Modeling, and Perspective Taking.

2. J. A. Grundfest, Citizen Participation in Broadcast Licensing Before the FCC, Santa Barbara: RAND, 1976.

3. D. Carmody, "Challenging Media Monopolies," New York Times Magazine, July 31, 1977.

GOVERNMENT

I. Government agencies should include citizen education and involvement among their priorities for program development and selection.

II. All federally-sponsored programs where appropriate should be required to include a description of their impact upon the development of citizen competence among those served, and of the participation of the community in program planning and operation.

III. Government support, both financial and otherwise, should be further extended to community organizations which promote or utilize citizen involvement.

IV. The federal government should improve its information dissemination network to provide readily available information on government programs and procedures to all citizens. State and local governments should support corresponding programs.

V. A systematic and definitive effort should be initiated to broaden citizen access to government activities and institutions.

VI. An effort should be made to place control of government programs as close to the local community as practical so as to facilitate and encourage citizen participation.

VII. Direct citizen involvement in the delivery of government services should be facilitated and encouraged wherever possible. Effective means of citizen involvement in policy-making should be identified and mandated for all government agencies.

VIII. Methods should be developed and made widely available which provide citizens and agency staff with training in the rationale and techniques of effective participation.

Commentary

The recommendations presented in the area of Government fall into three categories: those concerned with channeling government resources in support of citizen involvement; those concerned with increasing citizen access to government; and those concerned with citizen involvement in government programs.

- Channeling government resources in support of citizen involvement -

Recommendations I, II, and III, fall within the category of increasing government support of citizen education and involvement. Recommendation I identifies citizen involvement as a priority measure for program development. In the past, citizen education and citizen participation have been of secondary importance, resulting in a fragmented effort. The 1976 report of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare Task Force on Citizen Participation characterized that agency's citizen participation activities as informal and sporadic, adjunct rather than integral, and with little evaluation.[1] The Conference on Citizen Participation in Government Decision Making identified citizen participation authority and responsibility for most government agencies as "unclear, deficient, fragmented, or nonexistent."[2] To be effective, and to channel the necessary resources into research and program operation, education and participation must receive priority designations.

One method of indicating this priority status is indicated in Recommendation II, the impact statement. Like the environmental impact statement upon which it is modeled, this requirement is intended to provoke a review of all programs in their developmental stages, to assess their potential for citizen involvement. Where appropriate, citizen education and participation components can then be built into program operation.

Recommendation III provides for expanded government support of community organizations which promote citizen involvement. The role of community organizations has received increased recognition in recent years.[3] Their importance both in socialization and service delivery is virtually incalculable. Community organizations facilitate participation both as direct vehicles for involvement and as structures through which citizens can interact with government and other institutions. Recent reports, particularly that of the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs,[4] have raised doubts about the continued ability of private charitable organizations to survive.

Government support for community organizations can take a variety of forms. These include both direct organizational funding and provision of in-kind services to assist community organizations, and benefits such as tax deductions or credits for those who participate in community activities. An indirect method of support might be the inclusion of the citizen involvement component in the formula for calculating matching funds for federal grant requirements. Currently, some grant programs accept

in-kind contributions of services and some do not.[5] Those federal programs which do not accept evaluation of this volunteer component in the local match penalize community organizations which seek active citizen involvement (as in volunteer fire departments and medical services), and give preference to 'professional' rather than participatory groups.

- Increasing citizen access to government -

Recommendations IV and V deal with increasing citizen access to government. Earlier materials in this report have indicated the relative lack of knowledge of American citizens regarding their basic political institutions. Interaction with one's government, however, presupposes a familiarity with the practical reality of day-to-day governmental operation which simply does not exist for most citizens. To some extent, the federal government has attempted to deal with this problem through increased reliance on the Federal Information Centers. This expansion has been limited both in the number of centers and available personnel, and in the complexity and type of information presented. Several mechanisms might be utilized in implementing this Recommendation. They include further expansion of the Federal Information Center network, development of a data base on federal programs which can be widely distributed, "drop-in' centers staffed by each agency, program banks of successful community projects, and ombudsman offices. Local governments can establish similar programs.

Recommendation V suggests the need for opening government institutions to all citizens. This includes providing access for the handicapped to courts, agency offices, and government buildings, and providing opportunities for the more than 20 million Americans with a native language other than English.

- Citizen involvement in government programs -

Recommendations VI, VII, and VIII deal with increasing citizen involvement in government programs. The research behind these Recommendations may be found in the Summary of Selected Research, Involvement in Government Programs. The arguments for citizen involvement are a central focus of this report, but bear repeating. Participation is both a means and an end of citizen education. Through participation, citizens acquire the knowledge and skills necessary for effective citizenship. And through participation, each citizen fulfills the democratic function inherent within the philosophy of our political system. Participation provides the citizen input necessary both for the functioning of government programs and the development of the individual. Only through participation can the citizen directly affect the operation of

governmental institutions. And only through allowing participation can governmental programs receive the information and direction necessary to sustain support and establish successful program operation.

Citizen involvement can take many forms. Internships, both of youth and adults, are one method of acquainting citizens with the operation of government. A government-internship program for teachers might be an excellent method of disseminating practical information about political processes and governmental institutions to students. Volunteers involved in service delivery are another method of citizen involvement. At the federal level, a general prohibition against the use of volunteers exists, although agencies may seek a statutory exemption from the restriction. Removing that prohibition would enable an expansion of the volunteer force available to assist in service delivery. Direct assistance in policy-making is another option. This can be accomplished by bringing agencies closer to the public and actively seeking citizen advice. A variety of techniques for accomplishing this are discussed in the Summary of Selected Research.

FOOTNOTES

1. Report of the Task Force on Citizen Participation to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, October 1976, p. 13.

2. Proceedings of the Conference on Citizen Participation in Government Decision Making, At Square One, Washington: Federal Interagency Council on Citizen Participation, 1977, p. 7.

3. P. Berber and R. Neuhaus, To Empower People: The Role of Mediating Structures in Public Policy, Washington: American Enterprise Institute, 1977.

4. Report of the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs, Giving in America: Toward a Stronger Voluntary Sector, Washington: Filer Commission, 1975.

5. J. Stam and T. Stinson, "Voluntarism and Revenue Sharing," Journal of the Community Development Association, 1976.

PART B

Summary of Selected Research

I. Introduction

The following Summary of Research is intended to provide additional information to those interested in the evidence supporting the Recommendations. It should be understood that the following is both a summary and a selection; it is not intended to provide definitive information on the areas under consideration. Such a definitive effort would be far beyond the scope of the current study. Those interested in further information are directed to the references included at the end of each research section.

A review of research done by psychologists and those interested in educational evaluation can serve several functions. First, it can indicate existing deficiencies in basic competencies of citizenship and provide benchmarks for the comparison of future evaluations. Some research of this kind has been included in Chapters I and II. A second function of research is to suggest psychological characteristics of specific age groups or of young people in general which are important for the most effective design of citizen education programs. Related to this are a number of studies which deal with important aspects of social and personality development among young people: moral development, development of the ability to take the perspective or point of view of someone else, and the development of willingness to behave in ways which benefit others (even without external reward). This is often called pro-social behavior and includes generosity, altruism, sympathy, helping people in distress, sharing possessions, and participating in activities which reduce social injustice.[1] The inclusion of these studies responds to an important tenet of education, that the growth of cognitive functions should not be viewed in isolation from aspects of personal growth such as self-esteem, sense of identity, and interpersonal relationships.[2] A third purpose of this review is to point to a few studies which evaluate attempts to enhance capacities related to citizen education.

[1]Definition of pro-social behavior adapted from P. Mussen and N. Eisenberg-Berg, Roots of Caring, Sharing, and Helping: The Development of Pro-Social Behavior in Children. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1977.

[2]E. Shapiro and B. Biber, "The Education of Young Children: A Developmental Interaction Approach." Teachers College Record, 1972, 74, 55-79.

II. Perspectives, Values and Behavior

A. Perspective-Taking, Global and Intercultural Education

Research on perspective-taking -- the ability to see a situation from the point of view of another individual or another group -- has greatly accelerated in recent years as a result of its increasing recognition as an essential element in cognitive and social development. Perspective-taking is seen by many as a prerequisite for the development of an understanding of government and society and willingness to participate in behavior which benefits others (pro-social behavior).

Rudimentary perspective-taking abilities characterize children as young as four years of age, who can usually identify situations which evoke happy feelings. It is not until middle childhood, however, that children are able to identify the emotions of people who are markedly dissimilar to themselves in important ways or who are in unfamiliar situations, and to view a social episode from the point of view of each participant before coordinating the different perspectives.[1] There is some argument among researchers as to whether simple anticipation of emotional reactions to a situation, as in young children, is sufficient evidence for the existence of perspective-taking skills. Borke[2] argues that anticipation of situational responses indicates awareness of others' feelings (and thus perspective-taking abilities), regardless of whether the correct judgments are obtained through identification with the other person, or through projection of the child's own feelings on to the other person. Chandler and Greenspan[3], on the other hand, believe that perspective-taking implies more than simply anticipating how another individual might feel. According to these authors, the defining criterion is the correct anticipation of someone's feelings when those thoughts and feelings are different from one's own, an ability which does not appear until middle childhood. It is this level of feeling which is required to understand the perspective of those from other cultural groups, as global or ethnic studies objectives often require.

There is considerable research which supports the view that perspective-taking skills are related to social cooperation and competence, and that delay in the development of these skills is linked to various forms of social deviancy. In a study by Chandler,[4] 45 chronically delinquent boys aged 11-13 were found to be deficient in social-cognitive role-taking when compared with non-delinquents. A program was implemented to enhance the adolescents' perspective-taking capacities. An experimental group spent half an hour a week, for ten weeks, making video-tapes of skits involving characters of their own age and observing their own performance in different roles in these skits. The delinquents who participated in this training improved more in their

role-taking ability and showed lower subsequent delinquency than another group which made animated cartoons or films about their neighborhood. The group neither performed different roles nor watched their own performance.

In another study,[5] kindergarten children played the role of someone in need of help and of a helper, in such situations as a child falling and hurting herself. The next day while the child was playing alone in a playroom, cries of distress were heard from an adjoining room. Girls who had the training in role playing responded to these distress signals significantly more frequently than a control group.

A study by Weinhemier[6] suggests that perspective-taking may be important for general interpersonal competence. It was found that eight-year-olds were more capable of reconciling the perspectives of others than were five-year-olds, who instead chose conforming behavior. Skill in reconciling perspectives was found to occur more frequently when the situation involved children rather than adults. The author suggested that children who were incapable of taking the perspective of others tended to display conformity and independence when these behaviors were inappropriate.

Enhanced perspective-taking, particularly as it has been found to be influenced by video presentations and role playing, has tremendous potential for moral development education and citizen education. This is especially true in assisting individuals to take the perspective of those who are different from themselves and in helping individuals who are considering antisocial acts to understand their potential effect on victims. Two other areas in which these skills are of special importance are global perspectives and intercultural perspectives.

Although the history of international education programs has roots which go back nearly 100 years in this country, the attempt to foster a truly global perspective through citizen education can be traced back about ten years; emphasis on international human rights and on transnational linkages is even more recent.[7]

Although older students tend to be more knowledgeable about international issues than younger ones, there is some tendency for greater stereotyping and lessened flexibility of attitudes toward people in other nations to appear at about the age of twelve.[8,9] There seems to be a period between eight and twelve when global perspectives can be fostered especially effectively.

A few studies have investigated the effects of educational programs on international attitudes. A Concept of Culture unit (with a cognitive orientation) was found to moderate some extreme forms of ethno-centrism on both a post-test and a delayed post-test.[10] A study on the effects of a social studies program, The Family of Man, on third graders' view of foreign peoples found that those who studied these units used fewer negative descriptive adjectives and had a more comprehensive view both of other nations and of the United States.[11]

An investigation of the most successful means for teaching international economics found that those teachers who spent their time stating and explaining facts had students who scored less well on a follow-up test.[12] The stress on international human rights is too recent to have been evaluated in this way.

The importance of ability to view the world from the perspective of other cultural groups is not limited to consideration of foreign cultures. The growing recognition of the importance of cultural pluralism in the United States has stimulated educational efforts in ethnic and cultural heritage studies. To enhance intercultural perspectives, the Ethnic Studies Program Act was passed by Congress in 1972. The one-year projects funded under the Act have produced little in the way of systematic evaluation. A Task Force of the National Education Association made recommendations based on their assessment of the projects funded in the first year.[13] While this report did not provide a research base for ethnic studies, a subject which the Task Force recognized as important, the recommendations do offer suggestions for procedural improvements in the program.

Citizenship in an ethnically pluralistic context requires perspective-taking, or an awareness of the many and diverse communities in which individuals participate, and a respect for cultural diversity; intercultural ethnic studies represent an important aspect of citizen education. This area also has potential for involving both family and community groups as well as schools.

REFERENCES

1. C. U. Shantz. :The Development of Social Cognition." In E. Mavis Hetherington, Review of Child Development Research, v.5. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975, pp. 257-323.

2. H. Borke. "Chandler & Greenspan's 'Ersatz Egocentrism'. A Reply to H. Borke." Developmental Psychology, 1972, 7, 107-109.

3. M. J. Chandler and S. Greenspan. "Ersatz Egocentrism: A Reply to H. Borke." Developmental Psychology, 1972, 7, 104-106.

4. M. J. Chandler. "Egocentrism and Antisocial Behavior: The Assessment and Training of Social Perspective-Taking Skills." Developmental Psychology, 1973, 9, 326-332.

5. E. Staub. "Use of Role Playing and Induction in Training for Pro-Social Behavior." Child Development, 1971, 42, 805-816.

6. S. Weinheimer. "Egocentrism and Social Influence in Children." Child Development, 1972, 43, 567-78.

7. T. Buergenthal and J. V. Torney. International Human Rights and International Education. Washington, D. C.: U.W. Government Printing Office, 1976.

8. E. Hicks and B. K. Beyer. "images of Africa. Journal of Negro Education, 1970, 39, 155-70

9. W. E. Lambert and O. Klineberg. Children's Views of Foreign People. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1967.

10. W. P. Frech. "The Effect of Cognitive Training in Anthropology on Ethnocentric Attitudes." Psychology in the Schools, 1975, 12, 364-370.

11. C. L. Mitsakos. "Fames Project: Final Report." Unpublished mimeographed paper, Boston University, Massachusetts, 1976.

12. A. Bellak. The Language of the Classroom. New York: Teacher's College Press, 1966

13. Task Force, Ethnic Heritage Studies Program: Assessment of the First Year. Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1977

B. Moral Development Education

All education in schools and socialization in other social institutions has implicit, if not explicit, goals of fostering morality. Further, many choices which must be made by citizens are basically moral choices. Recent attempts to implement specific programs of moral development education have been approached primarily from a cognitive-developmental perspective (associated with the theory of Kohlberg and the educational development work of Fenton). The theory posits that an individual's judgments of morality move through an invariant sequence of stages ranging from hedonistic (oriented to reward and punishment) to conventional (rule-oriented) to morally principled. According to this theory, exposing an individual to a stage of moral reasoning slightly above his current one induces conflict which, when resolved by a kind of mental reorganization, results in a progression to a higher stage of moral reasoning.

Various educational programs intended to enhance moral development have used Kohlberg's rationale. Moral dilemmas are introduced in the classroom and active discussion between small groups of students at different levels of moral reasoning is encouraged. Evaluation of some programs has indicated that participation in such discussions facilitates attainment of the next higher stage of moral reasoning in many students. Blatt and Kohlberg[2] reported that students exposed to higher-stage arguments exhibited shifts toward higher moral reasoning, although there was no concomitant change in cheating behavior. Another study[3] similarly found that students who participated in the Fenton moral development program gained significantly more in moral maturity than non-participants, and exhibited some improvement in inquiry skills, knowledge, and positive attitudes toward politics.

There is some evidence that the effects of moral education programs do not appear until several months later.[4] It has been suggested that this long-term effect is due to the continued application of certain aspects of the program by teachers, such as the use of small group discussions to resolve interpersonal and moral conflicts.[5]

It is too early to conclude that moral education programs of this design (or any single design) should be implemented in all schools. First it is necessary to clarify the conditions which lead to changes in moral stages, to improve the instruments of measurement, and to accumulate some research on desirable teacher characteristics and skills, and associated aspects of school structure.[6] Furthermore, some questions have been raised as to whether real changes in moral reasoning are actually occurring, or whether higher level responses to these verbal dilemmas result from

learning which responses are expected or desirable; this is suggested by research which indicates that performance on moral dilemmas designed by Kohlberg is related to the nature of the task. The type and content of moral dilemmas and the mode of presentation employed (verbal or visual) may influence the ethical judgments of children,[7,8,9] which raises the question of generality of the effect.

A recent National Institute of Education project charged with developing a definition of ethical education placed a special stress on action and behavior.[10] A still more perplexing problem, therefore, is the modest relationship found between verbally stated values and actual behavior in the cognitively-oriented programs. One study[11] found that subjects at the principled levels of moral reasoning were less likely to cheat than those at the hedonistic or reciprocity stages. Other studies, however, have found little relationship. Bryan[12] concluded that verbal presentations of altruistic standards were most likely to increase prosocial verbalizations, whereas actual exposure to altruistic models was more likely to increase prosocial behavior. The implication here is that Kohlberg's tasks, which require verbalizations, may improve the level of verbalization about morality without necessarily affecting behavior. A study[13] which investigated the relation between moral judgment and moral behavior reported that moral reasoning exerted an effect on the type of evaluation given to another person but not on the individual's own behavior.

Various studies (discussed in other sections of Perspectives, Values, and Behavior) have indicated that modeling may be an equally or more effective means of modifying moral and altruistic behavior. The complexity of the interaction between the use of modeling and the cognitive-developmental approach for the enhancement of morality is indicated by a study[14] in which it was found that seventh graders who were originally at the two lowest stages of moral reasoning were influenced to move to higher levels by Kohlberg-Fenton procedures, while those originally at higher levels were not influenced. The authors suggested that the students at the lower levels of morality may have been more sensitive to social desirability so that social support for their verbal statements may have been the important aspect, rather than the cognitive conflict-resolution process suggested by Kohlberg.

Kaufman[15] has proposed a model which attempts to relate moral action more effectively to moral reasoning, and which consists of four components: values or attitudes specific to the situation; idealism or commitment of the individual to values; the utility of a choice in terms of balance of positive and

negative outcomes; and strength of habitual responses as a result of previous learning or modeling. Kaufman believes that the idealism or commitment to values component is the only element in the model which generalizes across situations; thus, stable changes in behavior can only be achieved through changes in commitment to values.

Biggs[16] has related Kaufman's model to his conceptualization of the two functions which schools may serve. According to this author, the first role (and the one most frequently found) is the maintenance role, which involves formal teaching and indoctrination of particular values and utilizes rules and sanctions to affect behavior. In terms of Kaufman's model, the emphasis of this approach is on the utility and habit components of morality which are situation-specific. Biggs suggests that this emphasismay explain the modest relation between moral reasoning and moral behavior. Biggs believes that the second function which schools may serve, but one which is not usually emphasized, is to focus on each individual's growth and to allow him/her to determine his/her own values. In this way, the attention is on the idealism component which both authors link directly to behavior. Finally, although theories like Kohlberg's stress peer interaction as an important influence upon moral development, little attention has been devoted explicitly to this aspect of educational programs.

In summary, research seems to suggest that if the purpose is to educate children to think and behave at higher stage of morality, it is necessary to not only aid in their cognitive development and moral reasoning, but to provide appropriate models and change school organization in order to strengthen the relation between moral reasoning and behavior. Because of the link between certain civic attitudes and moral judgments, educational programs with this focus are an important part of citizen education. This does not mean, however, that there is sufficient evidence to prescribe a single approach to moral education.

REFERENCES

1. E. Turiel. "Developmental Processes in the Child's Moral Thinking." In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's Manual of Child Development. New York: Wiley, 1970.

2. M. M. Blatt and L. Kohlberg. "The Effects of Classroom Moral Discussion upon Children's Level of Moral Judgment." Journal of Moral Education, 1975, 4, 129-161.

3. M. Lieberman. "Evaluation of a Social Studies Curriculum Based on an Inquiry Method and a Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Moral Education." Paper presented at the 1975 meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D. C.

4. C. Beck, E. Sullivan, and N. Taylor. "Stimulating Transition to Postconventional Morality: The Pickering High School Study." Interchange, 1972, 3, 28-37.

5. R. Selman and M. Lieberman. "Moral Education in the Primary Grades: An Evaluation of a Developmental Curriculum." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1975, 67, 712-716.

6. J. Rest. "Developmental Psychology as a Guide to Value Education: A Review of 'Kohlbergian' Programs." Review of Educational Research, 1974, 44, 241-249.

7. J. P. Buchanan and S. K. Thompson. "A Quantitative Methodology to Examine the Development of Moral Judgment." Child Development, 1973, 44, 186-189.

8. L. C. Jensen. "The Relationship Between Type of Sanction Story Content and Children's Judgments Which Are Independent of Sanction." Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1973, 122, 49-54.

9. M. J. Chandler, S. Greenspan, and C. Barenboim. "Judgments of Intentionality in Response to Videotaped and Verbally Presented Moral Dilemmas: The Medium is the Message." Child Development, 1973, 44, 315-320.

10. M. E. Blum. "Public Policy Considerations in Ethical Education." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, New York, April 5, 1977.

11. E. Turiel and G. R. Rothman. "The Influence of Reasoning on Behavioral Choices at Different Stages of Moral Development." Child Development, 1972, 43, 741-756.

12. J. H. Bryan. "Why Children Help: A Review." Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 87-104.

References (continued)

13. J. P. Rushton. "Generosity in Children: Immediate and Long Term Effects of Modeling, Preaching, and Moral Judgment." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 459-466.

14. J. J. Tracy and H. J. Cross. "Antecedents of Shift in Moral Judgment." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 26, 238-244.

15. H. Kaufman. Aggression and Altruism. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.

16. J. B. Biggs. "Schooling and Moral Development." In V. P. Varma and J. Williams (Eds.), Piaget, Psychology and Education. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1976.

C. Modeling, Pro-social Behavior and Agression

Social learning theory states that a majority of human behavior is learned observationally through modeling.[1] Standards of conduct are first established by instruction and modeling, and are later replaced by self-evaluative internal controls which serve as deterrents to transgressions.

Research strongly supports the use of modeling as a powerful tool to influence behavior. The widely recognized need to enhance prosocial and reduce antisocial behaviors in children has led psychologists to apply the principles of social learning theory and those principles have potentially wide applicability in citizen education as well.

One study[2] compared the effects of a model's verbalizations about behavior to actual actions. It was found that both the verbalization of an intent to give to charity and the actual behavior affected children's subsequent behavior, as compared to a control group where no model was presented. These authors reported, from their findings in a later study, that subjects who were in conflict about appropriate behavior were more likely to be influenced by either verbalizations of intent or by the act itself, while those not in conflict required exposure to the performing model in order to be influenced.

Another study[3] investigated the effects of prosocial behavior displayed in TV programs on children and found that those individuals who viewed a Lassie episode in which a prosocial act was an integral part of the plot helped more in a subsequent task than subjects exposed to a Lassie program without a prosocial episode, or to another neutral film. Leifer et al[4] concluded from their review of the literature that the longer the duration of exposure to prosocial behavior on TV, the more likely it would be for the modeled behavior to occur. Furthermore, prosocial TV was found to influence self-control, nurturance, and cooperation.

Various studies[5,6] have shown that exposing a child to an altruistic model enhances subsequent altruistic behavior. In an extensive review of the literature, Bryan[7] concluded that the most potent way to increase prosocial behavior is to provide appropriate models. There are also other factors which influence altruistic behavior. The donation of material goods by children, for example, is influenced by the child's perspective-taking ability[8], by whether the child has just experienced success, as opposed to failure, in a task[9], and by whether the child is made to feel that he has received an undeserved reward.[10]

It has been suggested that modeling combined with instruc-

tions has the greatest effect on behavior. In a study[15] which attempted to teach empathy to adults, models with different degrees of empathy either accompanied their behaviors with instruction on how to be empathetic or did not use instructions. The findings showed that the combination of an altruistic model and instructions had the most potent effect.

Although a few studies were reported on the prosocial effects of television, a larger proportion of such research relates to the influence of television violence upon aggression. All studies point to a similar conclusion: the more violence a child watches, the higher he or she is rated on scales of aggressive behavior. The only major study[12] which found contrary results has not been replicated in two subsequent studies.[13, 14]

Some of the earliest empirical work on the relation of TV violence to aggression found that there was a strong positive relationship between the violence rating of favorite programs (whether reported by mothers or fathers) and the aggression of third grade boys in the classroom, as reported by peers.[15] More than 400 of these subjects were followed up ten years later when they were approximately 18. A significant relation between third grade preference for violent television and aggression at age 18 was reported.[16] This study has been replicated in England.[17]

It has been reported[18] that children who viewed a 30-minute violent program were more likely to resort to aggression in solving their own inter-personal problems than those who watched less violent shows. Two studies,[19,20] in naturalistic settings also found that viewing violent cartoons increased aggressive and rule disobedient behavior.

All reviews conclude that exposure to violent television results in aggressive behavior; it may be that trying to induce prosocial behavior using educational means in the absence of changes in television programming is futile.

REFERENCES

1. A. Bandura. Social Learning Theory. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

2. M. E. Rice and J. E. Grusec. "Saying and Doing: Effects on Observer Performance." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 584-593.

3. J. N. Sprafkin, R. M. Liebert, and R. W. Poulos. "Effects of a Prosocial Televised Example on Children's Helping." Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 1975, 20, 119-126.

4. A. D. Leiffer, N. J. Gordon, and S. B. Graves. "Children's Television More Than Mere Entertainment." Harvard Educational Review, 1974, 44, 213-245.

5. J. H. Bryan and N. H. Walbeck. "The Impact of Words and Deeds Concerning Altruism Upon Children." Child Development, 1970, 41, 747-757.

6. J. E. Grusec. "Power and the Internalization of Self-Denial." Child Development, 1971, 42, 93-105.

7. J. H. Bryan. "Children's Cooperation and Helping Behaviors." In E. Mavis Hetherington, Review of Child Development Research, V.5. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

8. K. H. Rubin and F. W. Schneider. "The Relationship Between Moral Judgment, Egocentrism, and Altruistic Behavior." Child Development, 1973, 44, 661-665.

9. A. M. Isen, N. Horn, and D. L. Rosenhan. "Effects of Success and Failure on Children's Generosity." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 551-556.

10. G. T. Long and M. J. Lerner. "Deserving, the 'Personal Contract', and Altruistic Behavior by Children." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 551-556.

11. M. A. Perry. "Modeling, Instruction, and Empathy." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 173-179.

12. S. Feshbach and R. D. Singer. Television and Aggression. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

13. W. D. Wells. "Television and Aggression: A Replication of an Experimental Field Study." Unpublished manuscript, University of Chicago, 1972.

14. R. D. Parke, L. Berkowitz, J. P. Leyens, S. West, and R. Sebastian. "Movie Violence and Aggression: A Field Experimental Approach." Unpublished manuscript, Fels Research Institute and University of Wisconsin, 1972.

15. L. D. Eron. "Relationship of TV Viewing Habits and Aggressive Behavior in Children." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 193-196.

16. L. D. Eron, M. M. Lefkowitz, L. R. Huesmann, and L. O. Walder. "Does Television Violence Cause Aggression?" American Psychologist, 1972, 27, 253-263.

17. B. S. Greenberg. "British Children and Television Violence." Public Opinion Quarterly, 1974, 38, 531-547.

18. A. D. Leifer and D. F. Roberts. "Children's Responses to Television Violence." In J. P. Murray, E. A. Rubinstein, and G. A. Comstock, Television and Social Behavior, Vol. 2: Television and Social Learning. Washington, D.C.: GPO, pp. 43-180.

19. F. B. Steuer, J. M. Applefield, and R. Smith. "Televised Aggression and the Interpersonal Aggression of Preschool Children." Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 1971, 11, 442-447.

20. L. K. Friedrich and A. H. Stein. "Aggressive and Prosocial Television Programs and the Natural Behavior of Preschool Children." Society for Research in Child Development Monograph, 1973, 38, #4.

D. Mass Media

In addition to providing models, a major function of the media is to disseminate information about issues and events. Research suggests that the effects of this mode of communication are much more potent than and go beyond this simple function. It is well documented that the media can shape the political attitudes of adults and young people.[1,2] That the effects can be long-term was shown by Bogatz and Ball,[3] who found that the CBS National Citizenship Test produced changes in adolescent attitudes which persisted over a minimum period of six months.

The finding that exposure to T.V. news stimulates political interest[4] suggests that the media can be an important educational source. Other authors[5] found that newscasts can educate young people about the differences in the policies of political parties: for example, Mini-newscasts, especially those designed for children in the early elementary school years, have been found to be a valuable educational experience.[6]

A more basic problem, however, is to simultaneously improve the quality of television presentations with regard to their potential for stimulating citizen interest in issues and to provide links between the media and other sectors which will foster the development of skills of inquiry and advocacy among individuals of all ages. Some attempts in this direction have been made, as in Prime Time Television in Chicago, which provides monthly discussion guides to teachers about television programs broadcast by the networks. The importance of media education in the schools is beginning to be recognized so that some schools now offer instruction on the subject, either as a special course or as a unit of another course. In Finland one such program of media education has been evaluated and reported to be very successful.[7]

The effects of the media on prosocial behavior and aggression have been studied extensively by social scientists. Some of the major findings from the psychological literature are discussed under the section titled Perspectives, Values, and Behavior. See also discussion of media effects in Chapter 1.

REFERENCES

1. S. Chaffee, S. Ward, and L. Tipton. "Mass Communication and Political Socialization." Journalism Quarterly, 1970, 47, 647-659.

2. S. Kraus and D. Davis. The Effects of Mass Communication on Political Behavior. State College, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1976.

3. G. Bogatz and S. Ball. "Some Things You've Wanted to Know About Sesame Street." American Education, 1971, 7, 11-15.

4. M. Johnson. "Television and Politicization: A Test of Competing Models." Journalism Quarterly, 1973, 51, 447-455.

5. M. M. Conway, A. J. Stevens, and R. Smith. "The Relation Between Media Use and Children's Civic Awareness." Journalism Quarterly, 1975, 52, 531-538.

6. C. Atkin. "Political Socializing Effect on Television." Paper prepared for American Association for Public Opinion Research, 1977.

7. S. Minkkinen. "Why Mass Media Education Is Needed in Schools." Mimeographed paper. Tampere Finland: Institute of Mass Communication, 1974.

E. Self-Concept and Self-Esteem

Many theories of personality emphasize the importance of self-concept and self-esteem in the functioning of the individual. An individual's self esteem also has an effect on his or her participation and sense of confidence in dealing with social institutions. It is believed that the formation of the self-concept begins at a very early age when the child first becomes aware of parental reactions to him and acknowledges those reactions as a reflection of himself. A close relationship between self-appraisal and children's perception of their parents' feelings toward them has been reported by some authors.[1,2] The fact that parents can have a great impact on the formation of such an important aspect of the child's personality points to the importance of fostering parental sensitivity and insight into their own behavior.

The school years represent an important transition in the socialization of the child, during which teachers emerge as influential figures in the continuing development of self-concept and self-esteem. Significant positive correlations between children's perception of their teachers' feelings toward them and children's perception of themselves have been reported.[3,4] Furthermore, such perceptions have also been found to be positively correlated with academic achievement and with non-disruptive classroom behavior. The picture that emerges, however, is more complex. One study[5] suggested that when the teachers have high self-esteem, this may enhance the self-esteem of the children in the class. The teacher's self-worth apparently affects his/her behavior toward the child, who in turn interprets the behavior as an index of his/her value as a person.

Teachers' effects have been explained in terms of expectancies which are communicated to the child through nonverbal, as well as verbal, channels and which become a self-fulfilling prophecy. A well-known study by Rosenthal and Jacobson[6], in which they systematically varied the expectations that teachers had of their students, demonstrated this. Twenty percent of the children in given classes were pointed out to teachers as "bloomers" who were expected to show a large increase in intellectual performance. (In reality, bloomer children had been selected at random.) On a retest the bloomer children not only performed better academically than the control children, but they were also rated as happier, better adjusted, and more curious. Furthermore, the teachers expressed more liking for them. (Although this study has received some criticism for its design, its essential findings have been replicated.[7]) A replication of the Rosenthal and Jacobson study with some extension indicated an increase in the number of positive contacts and a decrease in the number of negative interactions in which the teachers engaged with bloomer children.[8]

Brophy and Good[9] conducted an observational study of dyadic contacts between teachers and individual students in four first grade classrooms. The data were interpreted as supportive of the Rosenthal and Jacobson findings. It was noted that teachers demanded better performance from those children for whom they had higher expectations and were more likely to praise such performance when elicited. In the case of students for whom they had low expectations, teachers were more likely to accept poor performance and were less likely to praise good performance when it occurred.

Nonverbal cues appear to be especially important in conveying expectations. Some researchers[10] demonstrated that tutors in a microteaching situation exhibited different patterns of nonverbal behavior with bright students than with average students. The behaviors which characterized the interactions with bright students were indices of approach and attraction including forward lean, eye gaze, affirmative head nods, and smiles.

The role of positive expectations in shaping individuals' behavior is further illustrated by a study[11] in which fifth graders were told once a day for eight days that they were neat and tidy people. With a second group an attempt to persuade them to be neat and tidy (along with associated reasons) was made once a day. The first approach was more effective in modifying littering behavior, perhaps because it implied something positive about the child.

Madsen[12] studied thousands of American children and concluded that they are not only quite competitive but in some cases almost sadistically rivalrous. Cooperative behavior may be verbally encouraged, but competitive behavior is actually rewarded in schools. One study[13] hypothesized that the cooperative and competitive behaviors of pairs of eight to twelve-year-old children would be influenced by their self-concepts, such that the pairing of children with high self-concept would lead to more cooperative behavior than the pairing of children with low self-concept. The rationale was that high levels of self-concept would be associated with confidence and would preclude the need to prove oneself better than someone else. In fact, the results were nearly the opposite; pairs of children where both were high in self-esteem were the most competitive, while pairs of high self-esteem children with low were the least competitive. Children with strong self-concepts moved into a competitive struggle immediately. High/low pairing led to more cooperation because the low self-concept children adopted cooperative attitudes and allowed the high self-concept children to win. Although a basic sense of self-confidence is important, there are certain situations where such self-concepts may not be linked with positive social behavior.

Some attempts to enhance self-concept and self-esteem in the school setting have been made. For example, behavior modification techniques involving the systematic use of positive, social reinforcement have been reported to be successful in enhancing self-esteem (assessed by the change in scores on a self-esteem questionnaire).[14]

In the political realm, the conceptual equivalent of self-esteem is a sense of political efficacy.[15] According to Bandura, a sense of efficacy is the conviction that one can successfully execute a particular behavior to produce certain outcomes. In the political sense, it may refer to an individual's belief that he can effectively bring about some changes; the strength of that belief determines the effort and persistence he will invest, and whether he will even attempt to respond to the perception of social problems with political action.

There is a massive amount of literature on sense of political efficacy, but most of it is related more to citizens' perceptions of the generalized responsiveness of the government; only recently have attempts been made to carefully assess the actual sense of political competence apart from these perceptions.

Button[16] used experimental units on government with twelfth graders to promote feelings of political efficacy and knowledge of strategies to bring about political and social change. The study is an interesting one because the author used classroom observations, questionnaires, and interviews. Anglos within the experimental group seemed to develop increased confidence and knowledge of concrete strategies, while Black students in the experimental group increased in more generalized political efficacy. The differences in political effectiveness between the group exposed and not exposed to the curriculum were especially striking when measured in an interview two months after completion of the unit. An interview measure is probably closer to the concept of citizen competence than the paper-and-pencil sense of efficacy attitude measures, and this study is, therefore, especially promising.

The relation of self esteem to the sense of citizen competence is important and needs further investigation.

REFERENCES

1. D. P. Ausubel, et al. "Perceived Parent Attitudes as Determinants of Children's Ego Structure." Child Development, 1954, 25, 173-183.

2. S. M. Jourard and R. M. Remy. "Perceived Parental Attitudes, the Self, and Security." Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1955, 19, 364-366.

3. W. B. Brookover and S. Thomas. "Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement." Sociology of Education, 1964, 37, 271-278.

4. H. H. Davidson and G. Lang. "Children's Perceptions of Their Teachers' Feelings Toward Them Related to Self-Perception, School Achievement, and Behavior." Journal of Experimental Education, 1960, 29, 107-118.

5. C. E. Edeburn and R. G. Landry. "Self-Concepts of Students and a Significant Other, the Teacher." Psychological Reports, 1974, 35, 505-506.

6. R. Rosenthal and L. Jacobson. Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

7. D. F. Anderson and R. Rosenthal. "Some Effects of Interpersonal Expectance and Social Interaction on Institutionalized Retarded Children." Proceedings of the 76th Annual Convention of the APA, 1968, 3, 479-480.

8. O.H. Meichenbaum, K. S. Bowers, and R. P. Ross. "A Behavioral Analysis of Teacher Expectancy Effects." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 306-316.

9. J. Brophy and T. Good. "Teachers' Communication of Differential Expectations for Children's Classroom Performance: Some Behavioral Data." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1970, 61, 365-374.

10. A. Chaikin, E. Sigler, and V. Derlega. "Nonverbal Mediators of Teacher Expectance Effects." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 30, 144-149.

11. R. L. Miller, P. Brickman, and D. Bolen. "Attribution Versus Persuasion as a Means for Modifying Behavior." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 430-441.

12. M. Madsen. "Cooperative and Competitive Motivation of Children in Three Mexican Subcultures." Psychological Reports, 1967, 20, 1307-1320.

13. J.J. Vance and B. O. Richmond. "Cooperative and Competitive Behavior as a Function of Self-Esteem." Psychology in the Schools, 1975, 12, 225-229.

14. M. E. Wolff. "The Influence of Positive School Reinforcement by the Teacher on the Self-Esteem of Fourth Grade Students." Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973 (Nov.), 34(5-A), 2406.

15. A. Bandura. Social Learning Theory. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.

16. C. B. Button. "Political Education for Minority Groups." In The Politics of Future Citizens, R. G. Niemi and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974, pp. 167-198.

F. Peer Tutoring

Tutoring of students by their peers or by those only a few years older has come into prominence in the last ten years. Although little objective evaluation exists, peer tutoring has been advocated as a way to help both slow students who need individual help and also older students who may have problems dealing with the subject matter at their own level. Some authors also believe that peer tutoring may serve other important functions, such as the enhancement of self-esteem and prosocial behavior, both of which are important to performance in the role of citizen.

One author[1] views peer tutoring as an opportunity to assign responsibility to the child; this is important in the promoting of prosocial behavior in general. In the tutoring situation the focus is on behavior which enhances others' welfare; the child, as a tutor, learns a basic societal norm, i.e., that it is expected of people to do things for others, and that engaging in responsible action is highly rewarded.

Another author[2] believes that tutoring can improve self-image and offer the low-achieving older student a source of pride. When a marginal student is made a tutor, he or she is compelled to learn the material better. This author claims that problem children may actually learn more while teaching other children than while sitting in class. It has also been suggested[3] that students with difficulty in school who tutor are learning as much as the one being tutored. Areas of tutor failure are likely to be emotional; by helping younger children the tutor is given a chance to relive the past and experience vicarious gratification.

As an educational tool, most of the evidence that points to the usefulness of tutoring is anecdotal. In a review of the literature, Devin-Sheehan, Feldman and Allen[4] concluded that the empirical evidence is inconclusive; while some projects show academic gains for both tutors and their students, others show no gains. It may be that peer or cross age tutoring needs to take place in a particular kind of school setting in order to be fully effective. Further research on the ways that tutoring of peers may foster a sense of social responsibility are called for.

REFERENCES

1. E. Staub. "To Rear a Prosocial Child. Reasoning, Learning by Doing and Learning by Teaching Others." In D. J. DePalma and J. M. Foley (Eds.) Moral Development. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1975, 113-135.

2. L. Lymovitz. "Children Helping Children." National Elementary Principal, 1975, 54, 41-43.

3. F. Pine and W. Olesker. "The School Failure as Tutor: An Exploratory Approach." Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1973, 2, 183-200.

4. L. Devin-Sheehan, R. S. Feldman and V. L. Allen. "Research on Children Tutoring Children." Review of Educational Research, 1976, 46, 355-385.

III. Parent Education

The critical role of parents during the early years of a child's development is well-established. Experiences in the home become the building-blocks of the child's personality and affect his self-concept, self-esteem, style of coping, and future interactions.

The need to make parents fully aware of the impact they have on their children has led to a recommendation for parent education. The combined effort of parents and schools seems especially important since both can be considered essential agents of socialization. Even though a variety of programs have been proposed, most tend to focus on improving cognitive outcomes rather than on the development of the child as an active and competent member of society. Gordon[1], for example, has done a number of field observational studies in which the emphasis has been on the influence of parents on intellectual performance, without regard for social development.

There is, however, some research which is not strictly associated with academic performance. Durrett[2] trained parents in communication skills which involved the use of eye contact, inviting children to speak more, and the use of selective attention when listening. It was noted that the children of parents who had this training talked more in a parent-child interview than did the children in the control group.

Brocher[3] described group sessions in which parents were asked to remember what it was like to be a child, and to play games which were similar to those they played as children, the rationale being that by allowing parents to relive their childhood they would become more understanding of their own children. According to Brocher, both parents and children were more satisfied with the parental-child roles at the end of the program. Unfortunately, however, an extensive evaluation was not done.

Jensen[4] trained a group of parents in communication skills and concluded on the basis of ratings that there had been a significant increase in genuineness, understanding, valueing, and accepting on the part of the parent. Furthermore, the children seemed to be even more aware of an increase in communication than were the parents.

Parent education for citizenship may be an especially challenging area of action since there are so few precedents in this field.

REFERENCES

1. I. Gordon. "What Do We Know About Parents as Teachers?" Theory Into Practice, 1972, 11, 146-149.

2. D. D. Durrett and P. A. Kelly. "Can You Really Talk with Your Child? A Parental Training Program in Communication Skills Toward the Improvement of Parent-Child Interaction." Group Psychotherapy and Psychodrama, 1974, 27, 98-109.

3. T. Brocher. "Group Methods in Parent Education." International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1975, 25, 315-321.

4. C. M. Jensen. "The Effect of Parent Group Awareness Training on Intrafamily Communication." Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 261-262.

IV. Effects of Participation in Schools and Other Settings

Considerable evidence has been gathered about the effects of participation in institutions on those who participate (especially in educational institutions). The positive value of student participation in the schools has received strong support from recent research. McPartland et al[1] examined 14 secondary schools and found that both students and teachers agreed on the necessity to augment student participation, especially in non-academic areas such as the regulation of political activity within the school and the determination of social rules. Students, however, tended to see a larger discrepancy between actual and desired participation across all issues than did teachers.

McPartland and his associates believe that participation may influence the individual in three ways: 1) it may increase social integration by providing a larger circle of friends and enhanced prestige; 2) it may provide new peer norms; and 3) it may provide experiences in decision-making and taking responsibility for these decisions. Participation which includes decision-making experiences has the most potent effects, and particular types of student involvement lead to different outcomes. Students in a school with a student court, for example, have been reported to have more positive attitudes toward regulations and procedures than those in other schools. The fact that this effect was true for all students and not merely those on the court suggests that vicarious as well as direct participation may be important. Participation in academic choices, such as in the selection of courses and teachers, has been found to be related to satisfaction and responsibility on the part of students.

The conclusions of McPartland et al are important for understanding the influence of school structure and participation on citizenship. Though students might be expected to be happier with permissive rather than strict rules, this study indicates that the aspect which determines school stability is not the permissiveness of rules, but rather the responsibility given to students for the making of the rules.

Ehman and Gillespie[2] conceptualized the school as a political system in order to establish the relations between system characteristics and students' attitudes toward school and society. Four types of school political systems were identified in the 13 secondary schools studied, all of which represented variations on an underlying bureaucratic organization. Characteristics of the first type, the participant system, consisted of a high level of student participation and leadership, open communication,

decision-making via consensus, and respect for individual ideas and experiences. One school, however, was designated as a "directed participant system" because there were certain limitations on students' decision-making.

The second type of school was characterized by an elite political system. In these schools the administration had monopolized participation, leadership, communication, and influence. Decision-making was done by one person or by a very small group, and coercion was frequently used. In the third type, the bureaucratic political system, the administration and teachers dominated. Decisions were made by a few groups at the top, and students bargained with those in power. In the coalitional political system, the fourth type identified, various groups with diverse interests participated and bargained with one another.

School political interest was found to be highest in elite schools and lowest in the directed participant school, where student expectations about participation in the power structure seemed to have been raised but not fulfilled. The amount of trust in other students and in adults were found to be above average in both the participant and the coalition schools. Ehman and Gillespie's conclusion was that not only did the underlying organizational characteristics of the schools differ, but that they seemed to have a differential effect on student attitudes.

Wittes[3], in a study of secondary schools, also offered support for the positive effects of student participation in decision-making. It was found, in particular, that participation resulted in a sense of personal control and lessened frustration when student interest was high. The author suggested that decision-making in the schools can be expanded with the participation of students, and that the power available to administrators and teachers need not be markedly reduced by such participation.

An evaluation of a recently developed civic education program[4] with a strong action component reported increases in student knowledge and a trend toward further participation. One study[5] reported changes in students' perceptions of community problems and in solutions to those problems as a result of participation in field work. The importance of participation in job settings has also been emphasized. Various authors[6,7] found a positive relationship between participation and job satisfaction among local government blue collar employees, and in a large corporation, respectively.

There has been some evaluation, primarily on a case by case basis, of the effects of participation in Office of Economic Opportunity community councils. Kramer[8] reviewed five War on

Poverty programs and distinguished different styles of participation and of decision-making. Recommendations for enhanced participation included the selection of individuals representing specific constituencies (e.g., agency clients), their mobilization around tangible issues, and allowance of a minimum period of three years to develop participation.

Some research done in small groups has related to the influence of participation on compliance and satisfaction with rules. One study[9] looked at the effects of participation on satisfaction with the decision-making process. The items used to measure satisfaction were attitudes towards the decision outcome, the role played in the group, decision-making procedures, intermember relationships and decision tasks. An analysis of the different degrees of participation revealed that the group which participated in all areas of the decision-making process (i.e., generation of ideas, evaluation, and choice) evidenced the most satisfaction. The authors concluded that perceptions of influence and satisfaction were affected by participation in diverse phases of the decision-making process and by the commitment to decisions.

It has been reported that decisions made by most groups are complied with by all the members, including those who originally opposed the decision.[10] However, participation in the making of rules has been related to the strength of the commitment to the emerging rules, as long as the rules are equitable.[11] In one study[12] subjects were given money to divide up with confederates of the experimenter. The confederate would either threaten the subject, make suggestions as to how the money should be divided, or say nothing at all The subjects then evaluated the person with whom they had to share the money. The results showed that evaluations were more a function of the fairness of the suggested amount of money than of the remarks of the confederate. This suggests that both equity and participation are important determinants of attitudes.

Much of the research on classroom and school climate has dealt with participation in discussion. Ehman[13] reviewed some of the research on classroom climate and concluded that teacher willingness to discuss controversial issues and the students' sense of freedom to discuss and voice their opinions have a facilitating effect on political attitude development.

In a study of nine countries, Torney, Oppenheim and Farnen[14] reported that the only classroom characteristic which was related positively to social aspects of citizenship -- knowledge of civics, lack of authoritarian attitudes, and participation in

political discussions -- was the students' perceptions that they were encouraged by teachers to engage and express ideas in discussion. Ehman[15] also reported evidence supporting the importance of school climate from a study of high school seniors. The students' perception of fairness in the operation of the school was related to higher levels of more general political trust.

Hawley[16] conducted a study in which he included both student perception and observations of teachers' classroom practices. Positive relationships were found between the teachers' interest in the ideas of students and students' interest in the ideas of their classmates, and between the number of opportunities provided by the teacher for students to interact with each other and the students' interest in the ideas of others. The author pointed to the importance of helping teachers enhance their "responsive flexibility."

Increased participation in decision-making in school and work settings appears to be associated with increased satisfaction with both the environment in which participation occurs and with society in general. Most of the evidence, however, is correlational and must be interpreted with caution

REFERENCES

1. J. McPartland, E. McDill, C. Lacey, R. Harris, and L. Novey. "Student Participation in High School Decision. A Study of Students and Teachers in Fourteen Urban High Schools." Center for Social Organization of Schools, New York, 1971.

2. L. H. Ehman and J. A. Gillespie. "The School as a Political System." Final Report for the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare National Institute of Education, Project No. 3-3067, 1975.

3. S. Wittes. "People in Power. A Study of Crises in Secondary Schools." Institutes of Survey Research, University of Michigan, 1970.

4. D. J. Donovan, "Turning Students on to Active Citizenship" Trenton, New Jersey: Department of Education, 1975

5. M. L. Palley. "Community Participation as a Teaching Resource." Teaching Political Science, 1975, 2, 201-211.

6. J. Licheron and T. D. Wall. "Attitudes Towards Participation Among Local Authority Employees." Human Relations, 1975, 28, 499-517.

7. S. D. Norton. "Employer-Centered Management, Participation in Decision Making and Satisfaction with Work Itself." Psychological Reports, 1976, 38, 391-398.

8. R. M. Kramer. Participation of the Poor: Comparative Community Case Studies in the War on Poverty. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

9. M. R. Cooper and M. Wood. "Effects of Member Participation and Commitment in Group Decision Making on Influence, Satisfaction and Decision Riskiness." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 127-134.

10. M. Horwitz. "The Recall of Interrupted Group Tasks: An Experimental Study of Individual Motivation in Relation to Group Goals." Human Relations, 1954, 7, 3-37.

11. J. Thibaut, N. Friedland, and L. Walker. "Compliance with Rules: Some Social Determinants." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 30, 792-801.

12. R. L. Michelini and L. A. Messe. "Reactions to Threat as a Function of Equity." Sociometry, 1974, 37, 432-439.

13. L. H. Ehman. In E. Kurfman, Review of Research in the Social Studies 1970-1975. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977.

14. J. V. Torney, A. N. Oppenheim, and R. F. Farnen. Civic Education in Ten Countries: An Empirical Study. New York: John Wiley, 1975.

15. L. H. Ehman. "Social Studies Teachers and Their Pupils." In M. K. Jennings and R. G. Niemi, The Political Character of Adolescence. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1974.

16. W. D. Hawley. "Reforming the Civics Curriculum Through the Restructuring of Teacher Behavior." Paper prepared for Midwestern Political Science Association, 1977.

V. Size of Institutions, with Particular Reference to Schools

Barker[1] proposed a theory which states that "undermanning," or the availability of more positions than there are people to fill them, forces individuals to participate more, to acquire more responsibility, and to engage in a more diverse set of activities.

In a comparison of behavioral settings in Kansas and Yoredale, England, Barker determined that twice as many settings needed to be filled in Kansas, and that more people, including adolescents, held more positions and had more responsibilities in that community. According to Barker, students should participate intensively in behavioral settings even when some necessary skills have not yet been fully developed.

An analysis of the effects of school size in Kansas revealed that even though the largest school had 65 times as many students as the smallest school, differences were not as striking with regard to behavioral settings (i.e., the number of environments available). Large schools were reported to have only eight times as many academic settings, and 2.3 times as many academic activities as the smallest school.[2] Participation in school activities was found to be highest in schools with a student body of 61-285. Students in the senior year of small schools were found to have engaged in more activities throughout their high school careers than the senior of large schools. A comparison of students in the junior year showed that small school students participated in more different kinds of activities, and that those in large schools tended to enter settings as an audience rather than as active participants. The authors concluded that the performance superiority of small schools was "reasonably consistent" throughout the non-academic areas of school life.

It appears that school size may interact with scholastic aptitude to increase participation. Barker and Gump[3] reported that the pressure for marginal students to participate was especially strong in the case of the small school. In a replication study, Willem[4] found that both marginal and regular students in small schools felt more obligated to participate than regular or marginal students from the larger schools.

One author[5] related high school size to nonacademic achievement and found that students in smaller high schools achieved more than those in large schools in the areas of leadership, writing, music and dramatic art. Similar findings were reported by Werts and Watley[6], who looked at the occupations of fathers of 127,125 students entering 248 colleges and computed the

probabilities of the son or daughter achieving in six different areas (science, speech, leadership, music, art and literature). The results showed that not only was there a similarity between father's occupation and son's achievement, but the farmers' children were found to be consistently high in oral, musical and leadership achievements. The authors interpreted their results in terms of the "undermanning" theory since most farm schools are small in size.

Some of the small group literature sheds some light on the issue of size. One author[7] varied group size (from 1 to 96) and found that the number of ideas produced increased as a negatively accelerated function of group size in both the threat and non-threat conditions. Apparently, the smaller groups felt less threatened or less inhibited than did the larger groups. Another study[8] found that as the size of the group or organization increased, communication decreased.

In summary, the value of smaller institutions for increasing participation has received considerable support in the studies of school size and as well as in studies of small groups.

REFERENCES

1. R. G. Barker. "Ecology and Motivation." In M.A. Jones (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1960.

2. R. G. Barker and P. V. Gump. Big School, Small School. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1964.

3. Ibid.

4. E. P. Willems. "Sense of Obligation to High School Activities as Related to School Size and Marginality of Students." Child Development, 1967, 38, 1247-1258.

5. L. L. Baird. "Big School, Small School: A Critical Examination of the Hypothesis." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60, 253-260.

6. C. E. Werts and D. J. Watley. "Paternal Influence on Talent Development." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 367-373.

7. J. R. Gibb. "The Effects of Group Size and of Threat Reduction upon Certainty in a Problem Solving Situation." American Psychologist, 1951, 6, 325.

8. B. P. Indik. "Organization Size and Member Participation: Some Empirical Tests of Alternatives." Human Relations, 1965, 18, 339-350.

VI. Citizen Participation in Government Programs

The decision to involve citizens in the operation of government programs necessitates a judgment that such participation is valuable. Edgar and Jean Cahn justify the expenditure of time and money involved in these programs on three grounds:

1) that it is a necessary concomitant of our faith in the dignity and worth of the individual;

2) that it is a means of mobilizing energy and resources; and

3) that it provides a source of special insight, of information, and of knowledge and experience.

The judgment in favor of citizen participation made in this report follows a similar argument. Participation is of sufficient societal value to be used in program administration regardless of some dimunition of efficiency.

However, one of the arguments against participation of citizens in governmental programs is exactly that of a loss of efficiency when compared to a purely professionally-administered program. The problem, as noted by Edgar and Jean Cahn, is a simple one:

> Democracy is expensive. It costs money to hold meetings, to consult people. It takes time, staff, and resources. And a commitment to democracy must necessarily be reflected, not only in organization charts, but in budgets and timetables and allocation of energies.[1]

The research on citizen participation programs is too sketchy to indicate a qualitative extent of inefficiency or even to reach the general conclusion that participation by citizens, per se, hinders program operation. Yin et al[2], in a review of citizen participation programs for HEW, list some of the problems that can hinder participation efforts:

1) unavoidable conflicts in control between lay participants and often technically-trained service providers;

2) existing local organizations do not appear to provide normally for participation by other than local elites, who are themselves not program beneficiaries;

3) development of participation in new local organizations often leads to excessive community conflict and possible cooptation by local elites; and

4) where participation has been dominated by beneficiaries, it has usually featured the transmittal of information or other perfunctory activities, rather than actions enabling the beneficiaries to exert any real control.

Despite these potential difficulties, Yin concluded that, in general, "citizen participation increases citizen influence, and increases it in such a way that does not adversely affect program effectiveness." Others, such as Cole[3], have reached similar conclusions about the success of participation in government programs. Schutler[4], in a discussion of citizen participation in planning by use of the charrette process (in which a group from the community together with program administrator work within a set time-frame to reach agreement) claimed that a cost-benefit analysis of such projects showed that for every cent spent in planning five dollars of in-kind services were donated, that project planning time was reduced by as much as six months to two years, and that new program support capital was generated.

Contrary views have been expressed by a number of authors, particularly in reference to the programs of the late 1960's. Aleshire[5] describes the failure of Model Cities and Community Action Program participants to meet established planning deadlines and requirements. Arnstein[6] has described the perceptions of Philadelphia residents toward these programs in an article aptly entitled "Maximum Feasible Manipulation." Mogoluf[7] and Speigel[8] have documented the difficulties experienced by a wide range of programs in dealing with citizen input and participation in decision making.

On the basis of present evidence it is difficult to evaluate the effect of citizen participation on program activity. Many of the problems described above resulted more from unwillingness to deal with citizens or with ignorance of proper techniques than from an inherent problem of citizen participation. The complexity of program activity in natural community settings, and the relative absence of extensive evaluation efforts in past programs prevent drawing general conclusions about endemic problems of participation or about methods for overcoming such difficulties.

Further research is also needed in the area of participation techniques. In 1976, the Federal Highway Administration[9] completed a study of citizen involvement in transportation planning. One portion of that study catalogued over 40 methods of including

citizen participation in program activity, and listed the probable uses and advantages of each method. Unfortunately, we have little information on which to make a comparison of this sort.

The only area in which comparative strengths of participation techniques has been examined is that of citizen advisory boards and committees. Yin et al[10], in a study of 39 programs, found that advisory boards resulted in greater implementation of citizen ideas than did committees (69% to 52%). O'Donnell and Reid[11], in a study of public welfare participation programs, discovered that 43% of the citizen advisory boards helped to increase community support, versus only 33% of the committees; that 39% of the boards brought in outside resources, versus only 28% of the committees; and that 34% of the boards developed innovations in agency operations which improved services, versus 18% of the committees.

Research on other techniques has been impressionistic or limited to evaluations of single methods. Lovrich and Taylor[12] have examined the usefulness of citizen surveys in evaluating local government services. Valleau[13] has shown the use of opinion surveys in evaluating and planning a specific program's operation, and in providing information about the program to the community. Shepard[14] has examined the use of referenda in local policy-making. Murray and Berrill[15] have examined the use of structured small group issue discussion sessions by the Citizen Feedback Project of New York City and found it a possible means of providing information to officials, establishing feelings of relevance and contributions in the participants, and creating follow-up groups of community residents. Van Meter[16] has illustrated the use of community participation in the budgeting process through an examination of the League of Women Voters in Cincinnati. Whether alternative methods would have produced equal, or better, results in the above cases has not been determined.

General information on successful methods of producing effective participation have been equally limited. The National Highway Safety Administration[17] reviewed transportation participation programs and suggested that chances of success were increased by the following factors:

1) the individual perceives direct benefit to himself;
2) the scope of change sought is relatively small and direct;
3) the degree of influence on the problem is direct; and
4) the initiative required is relatively low.

A final area requiring further research is that of participation training, for both agency staff and community participants.

Briscoe[18] has shown the use of teaching problem-solving techniques to community boards. McClelland[19] has demonstrated that training Community Action Agency staff members can make them more receptive and responsive to the needs and demands of community participants. One potential difficulty with training of this sort has been suggested by Onibokun and Curry[20]. In a study of participants in a rapid transit program they discovered that participant satisfaction varied with level of previous participation experience. Those participants who were more experienced were less satisfied with lower levels of allowed initiative and influence. This suggests that if participation training is to be provided, it will necessitate the involvement of citizens at participation levels above those of minimum authority.

REFERENCES

1. E. and J. Cahn. "Citizen Participation," in H. Spiegel (ed.), Citizen Participation in Urban Development. Washington: NTL, 1968.

2. R. K. Yin, W. A. Lucas, P. Szanton, and J. A. Spindler. Citizen Organizations: Increasing Client Control Over Services. Santa Barbara: RAND, 1973.

3. R. L. Cole. Citizen Participation and the Urban Policy Process. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Health, 1974.

4. B. Schuttler. "It Works." Public Management, 1975, 28, 13-15.

5. R. Aleshire. "Power to the People: An Assessment of the Community Action and Model Cities Experience." Public Administration Review, 1972, 32, 428-443.

6. S. Arnstein. "Maximum Feasible Manipulation." Public Administration Review, 1972, 32, 377-389.

7. M. B. Mogoluf. "Advocates for Themselves: Citizen Participation in Federally Supported Community Organizations." Community Mental Health Journal, 1974, 46, 66-76.

8. H. Spiegel. Citizen Participation in Federal Programs: A Review. Journal of Voluntary Action Research, Monograph No. 1, 1971.

9. U.S. Dept. of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. Effective Citizen Participation in Transportation. Washington: Federal Highway Administration, 1976.

10. Yin, op. cit.

11. E.J. O'Donnell and O.M. Reid. "Citizen Participation in Public Welfare Boards and Committees." Welfare in Review, 1971, 9, 19-26.

12. N.P. Lovrich and G.T. Taylor. "Neighborhood Evaluation of Local Government Services: A Citizen Survey Approach." Urban Affairs Quarterly, 1976, 12, 197-222.

13. T.F. Valleau, "Citizens Participate in Portland, Maine Community Development Planning Through Community Opinion Survey." Journal of Housing, 1976, 33, 444-445.

14. W.B. Shepard. "Participation in Local Policy-Making: The Case of Referenda." Social Science Quarterly, 1975, 56, 55-70.

15. A.F. Murray and A. Berrill. "Citizen Feedback in a Metropolis." Social Work, 1975, 20, 240-241.

16. E. Van Meter. "Citizen Participation in the Policy Management Process." Public Administration Review, 1975, 35, 804-812.

17. U.S. Dept. of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Office of Driver and Pedestrian Programs. Citizen Participation in Highway Safety. Washington: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 1974.

18. R.V. Briscoe. "Behavioral Community Psychology: Training a Community Board to Problem Solve." Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1975, 8, 157-68.

19. D.C. McClelland. "Effects of Power Training on Community Action Agencies." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1975, 11, 92-115.

20. A Onibokun and M. Curry. "An Ideology of Citizen Participation: The Metropolitan Seattle Transit Case Study." Public Administration Review, 1976, 36, 269-277.

APPENDIX A

Letter Requesting Recommendations

NATIONAL CENTER FOR VOLUNTARY ACTION

1785 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036 (202) 797-7800

March 23, 1977

Dear Friend:

We are writing to solicit your suggestions as to specific policy recommendations for the improvement of citizenship education in America. Such recommendations will comprise a significant part of a state-of-the-art report on citizen education to be delivered to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare this year. The report will include a conceptual overview of citizen education; the case for citizen education in the past, present and future; a synthesis or map of current efforts in citizen education; and recommendations for future action by policy-makers and practitioners. The usefulness of this report will be largely determined by the quality and practicality of its recommendations. Thus, we are anxious to solicit the views of knowledgeable people.

Our report represents one of several efforts by the U. S. Office of Education to respond to a growing recognition that the relationship between citizen and government must be revitalized in order to restore the meaning of "consent of the governed" and the notion of "the citizen of responsibility." This revitalization must include a restatement of the goals of citizenship education and the tools available to implement those goals. We must also identify the appropriate roles and relationships of governmental sectors and non-governmental institutions.

Would you share with us your specific policy recommendations in this area? For each recommendation would you (1) identify the specific problem to which your policy is addressed; and (2) describe how your policy recommendation would contribute to resolving that problem. The following may be helpful in illustrating the suggested format for your response:

Specific Policy Recommendation:

That governmental agencies revise procedures for the selection and promotion of staff in order to incorporate criteria of demonstrable competence in encouraging effective citizen participation in the decision-making process.

Specific Problem:

Agency staff are neither well trained in nor rewarded for encouraging effective citizen participation in decision-making.

Relationship of Policy to Problem:

This policy should provide the skills and incentive for governmental officials to open up their operations to greater citizen involvement.

Although the preceding example is related to government policy, we urge you to offer recommendations bearing on other sectors of society such as business and industry, labor, media, religion, education, private voluntary organizations, and the home and family as well. Recommendations may cover a broad spectrum of concerns, including such areas as organizational structure and management, curriculum, staffing, training, legislation, standards, activities, and research. If you have already prepared relevant survey data, position papers, or recommendations, please forward them.

Your responses will be reviewed by a broad group of representative leaders in the field of citizen education. The final report, including recommendations, will be widely disseminated to you and others concerned with the future of citizen education and participation.

Thank you in advance for your effort on this important issue. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

Badi G. Foster
James I. Luck
Co-Chairmen
Citizen Education Task Force

p.s. In order to assemble this data, we need to receive your response by around the first of April. Please send your recommendations to:

Citizen Education Task Force
National Center for Voluntary Action
1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

APPENDIX B

Partial Listing of Persons

Receiving Recommendation Request

Dr. Ralph Abernathy, President
Southern Christian Leadership Conference
334 Auburn Avenue, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Martin Agronsky
P.O. Box 2626
Washington, D.C. 20013

Professor Lee F. Anderson
Department of Political Science
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Honorable Gregory R. Anrig
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
182 Tremont Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02111

Charles Asbury
Miami-Dade Community College
11380 N.W. 27th Avenue
Miami, Florida 33167

Harry S. Ashmore, President
Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions
Box 4068
Santa Barbara, California 93103

Lyn Aument, Public Information Director
National Congress of American Indians
1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Geraldine Bagby, Vice President
The Danforth Foundation
222 S. Central
St. Louis, Missouri 63105

Dr. Stephen K. Bailey
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Alden G. Barber, Chief Scout Executive
Boy Scouts of America
North Brunswick, New Jersey 08902

Msgr. Geno Baroni, President
National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs
4408 8th Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20017

Professor Daniel Bell
Department of Sociology
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Ms. Carole Berke
U.S. Conference of Mayors
1620 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dr. Robert Binswanger
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
University of Maine
Bangor, Maine 04401

William G. Bowen, President
Princeton University
1 Nassau Hall
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner
Human Development and Family Studies
Human Ecology School
E60MUR
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14853

Dr. Frank Brown, Director
IDEA
Information and Service Program
P.O. Box 446
Melbourne, Florida 32901

Thomas Brown, Executive Director
Friends Council on Education
1507 Cherry Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

Honorable M. Anne Campbell
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Ted Carpenter, Executive Director
National Citizen's Committee for Broadcasting
1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 402
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dr. Jay Carsey, President
Charles County Community College
P.O. Box 910
LaPlata, Maryland 20646

Patrick F. Chorpenning
31 Summer Street
Rockport, Massachusetts 01966

A.W. Clausen
The Bank of America
P.O. Box 37000
San Francisco, California 94137

Joan Ganz Cooney, President
Children's Television Workshop
1 Lincoln Plaza
New York, New York 10023

Art Cowles, Vice President
KOPPERS
1201 Koppers Building
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15129

Honorable Joseph M. Cronin
Superintendent of Education
Illinois Office of Education
Springfield, Illinois 62777

Edward Dambruch
Rhode Island Teacher Center
Rhode Island Department of Education
Providence, Rhode Island 02908

Ms. Susan Davis, Executive Director
National Self-Help Resource Center
1800 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

Walter Davis, Director of Education
American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations
815 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Donald Eberly
Office of Policy and Planning
ACTION
Washington, D.C. 20525

Diane Eisenberg
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Pablo Eisenberg
Center for Community Change
1000 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

Amitai Etzioni, Director
Center for Policy Research, Inc.
475 Riverside Drive
New York, New York 10027

Edwin Fenton, Director
Carnegie-Mellon Education Center
Carnegie-Mellon University
5000 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

J. Blaine Fister, Director
Public Education Concerns
National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.
475 Riverside Drive
New York, New York 10027

Dr. Roy Forbes
Education Commission of the States
700 Lincoln Tower
1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

C. Welton Gaddy
Director of Christian Citizenship Development
Christian Life Commission of the Southern Baptist Covention
460 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

James Garbarino
Boystown Center for the Study of Youth Development
11414 W. Center Road, Suite 210
Omaha, Nebraska 68144

John W. Gardner, Chairman
Common Cause
2030 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Cecil L. Gilliatt, President
National School Boards Association
800 State National Bank Plaza
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Norman Gross
American Bar Association
1155 E. 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637

John J. Gunther, Executive Director
United States Conference of Mayors
1620 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dr. Samuel Halperin
Institute for Educational Leadership
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 310
Washington, D,C, 20036

Byron W. Hansford, Executive Secretary
Council of Chief State School Officers
1201 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Willis Harmon
Executive Director, Education
Stanford Research Institute
Stanford, California 94305

James A. Harris, President
National Education Association
1201 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Rose Hayden
International Education Project
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

George Alexander Heard
Chancellor
Vanderbilt University
Kirkland Hall
Nashville, Tennessee 37240

Dorothy I. Height, President
National Council of Negro Women, Inc.
815 Second Avenue, 9th Floor
New York, New York 10017

Dr. Robert Heilbroner
New School for Social Research
65 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10003

Joel Henning
American Bar Association
1155 East 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Terry Herndon, Executive Director
National Education Association
1201 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Theodore Hesburgh, President
Notre Dame University
Corby Hall
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

Russell A. Hill, Director
Moral/Citizenship Education
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street, Suite 1700
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

John Holcomb, Director
Resource Center
Foundation for Public Affairs
1220 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Carl Holman, President
National Urban Coalition
1201 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

Kenneth Howey
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis Teacher Center
2605 Silver Lane, N.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55421

Robert M. Hutchins, Chairman
Fund for the Republic
Box 4068
Santa Barbara, California 93103

Dr. David Hyatt, President
National Conference of Christians and Jews
43 West 57th Street
New York, New York 10019

Sidney Johnson
Family Impact Seminar
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Vernon E. Jordan, Executive Director
National Urban League
55 E. 52nd Street
New York, New York 10022

Herman Kahn, Director
Hudson Institute
Croton-on-Hudson, New York 10520

Donald Kell, President
Lutheran Education Association
3773 Geddes Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105

Gwen Kennerick
314 State Office Building
Mitchell Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Carol K. Kimmel, President
National Congress of Parents and Teachers Association
700 North Rush Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Evron M. Kirkpatrick
Executive Director
American Political Science Association
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Peggy Lampl, Executive Director
League of Women Voters
1730 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dr. Robert Lamson
Program Manager
Division of Intergovernmental Science and Public Technology
National Science Foundation
Washington, D.C. 20550

Otto N. Larsen, Executive Director
American Sociological Association
1722 N. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20032

Barry E. Lefkowitz, Director
Institute for Political/Legal Education
Box 426
Glassboro-Woodbury Road
Pitman, New Jersey 08071

Irving Levine
Institute on Pluralism and Group Identity
American Jewish Committee
165 East 56 Street
New York, New York 10022

John Lewis
Voter Education Project
52 Fairlie Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Donald G. Livingston, President
CORO Foundation
Northern California Center
149 9th Street
San Francisco, California 94103

Dr. J.E. Lowery
Chairman of the Board
Southern Christian Leadership Conference
330 Auburn Avenue, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

William Lucy, President
Coalition of Black Trade Unionists
1010 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Robert H. McBride, President
National Association of State Boards of Education
2480 West 26th Avenue, Suite 215
Denver, Colorado 80211

Michael McCloskey, Executive Director
Sierra Club
220 Bush Street, Mills Tower
San Francisco, California 94104

C. Peter McColough
Chairman of the Board
Xerox Corporation
Highridge Park
Stamford, Connecticut 06904

Michael Maccoby
4825 Linnean Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

John W. Macy, Jr., President
Corporation for Public Broadcasting
888 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Katherine Maddox, Director
Kanawa Valley MultiTeacher Education Center
200 Elizabeth Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25311

Gordon Manser
5800 Arlington Avenue
Apartment 17B
Riverside, New York 10471

Ms. Vilma S. Martinez
General Counsel
Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund
145 19th Street
San Francisco, California 94103

Dr. Byron Massialis
Educational Management Systems
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Edward J. Meade, Jr.
Program Officer
Division of Education & Research
The Ford Foundation
330 E. 43rd Street
New York, New York 10017

R.P. Merridew, Secretary
Kiwanis International
101 East Erie Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Harriet E. Miller, Executive Director
American Association of Retired Persons
1909 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20049

Jonathan Moore, Director
Institute of Politics
Harvard University
78 Mount Auburn Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Irving Morrissett, Executive Director
Social Science Education Consortium
855 Broadway
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Charles S.H. Mott, President
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
510 Mott Foundation Building
Flint, Michigan 48502

Rev. Msgr. Olin J. Murdick
Secretary for Education
U.S. Catholic Conference
1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Samuel M. Nabrit, Executive Director
Southern Fellowship Foundation
795 Peachtree Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Harriet Naylor
Director of Volunteer Development
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare
309 B South Portal Building
Washington, D.C. 22204

Dr. Fred M. Newmann, Director
Development of Citizen Action
Curriculum
University of Wisconsin
225 North Mills Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Honorable Ewald B. Nyquist
Commissioner of Education
State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224

Leonard P. Oliver
Special Assistant to the Chairman
National Endowment for the
Humanities
806 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506

Layton Olson, President
National Student Education Fund
2000 P Street, N.W.
Suite 305
Washington, D.C. 20036

Jack Ossofsky, Executive Director
National Council on the Aging
1828 L Street, N.W.
Suite 305
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dean Phillips, President
Goodwill Industries of America, Inc.
9200 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20014

Honorable John C. Pittenger
Secretary of Education
State Department of Education
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Nancy Porter
Special Assistant for External
Affairs
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare
Room 5525, HEW-N
Washington, D.C. 20202

Donald R. Quayle, President
National Public Radio
2025 M Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

The Honorable Albert H. Quie
U.S. House of Representatives
2182 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dorothy Reynolds
Executive Director
Columbus Area Leadership Program
1501 Neil Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201

Dorothy Rich
Home and School Institute
3301 Newark Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

Dr. Robert Richburg, Dean
Valencia Community College
P.O. Box 3028
Orlando, Florida 32802

David Riesman
Department of Social Relations
William James Hall 280
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Honorable Wilson Riles
Superintendent of Public Instruction
and Director of Education
State Department of Education
Sacramento, California 95814

Michael S. Robison
North Carolina Office of
Citizen Participation
401 Wilmington Street
aleigh, North Carolina 27601

Ms. Rose Robinson, Executive
Director
American Indian Press
1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Room 306
Washington, D.C. 20036

Ray Roper, Executive Vice
President
United States Jaycees
49 West 21st Street
P.O. Box 7
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74102

David Rosen
National Student Lobby
2000 P Street, N.W. Suite 410
Washington, D.C. 20036

Stan Rosenberg, Project Director
Citizen Involvement Training
Project
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts 01003

Dr. Roger Rosenblatt
The New Republic
1220 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dr. William J. Russell
Program Officer for Elementary
and Secondary Education
National Endowment for the
Humanities
806 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506

Patrick Saccomandi
Independent Foundation
1029 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Paul B. Salmon, Executive Director
American Association of School
Administrators
1801 North Moore Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Edward Schwartz
Institute for the Study of
Civic Values
401 North Broad Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19108

Gene L. Schwilck, President
The Danforth Foundation
222 South Central Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri 63105

Dr. Cecily S. Selby, National
Executive Director
Girl Scouts of the U.S.A.
830 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Albert Shanker, President
American Federation of Teachers
11 Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Honorable Mark R. Shedd
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 2219
Hartford, Connecticut 06115

Dr. Paul Sherry, Executive
Associate for Planning and Strategy
Mrs. Helen Webber, General Secretary
United Church of Christ
Board of Homeland Missions
Health and Welfare Division
287 Park Avenue, South
New York, New York 10003

Mrs. Wakelee R. Smith
President General
National Society
Daughters of the American Revolution
1776 D Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Philip B. Swain, President
National School Boards Association
P.O. Box 1496
Evanston, Illinois 60204

Daniel Thurz
B'nai B'rith
1640 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Tom Tobin, President
U.S. National Student Association
2115 S Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008

Alvin Toffler
[illegible]0 E. 78th Street
New York, New York 10021

Alpha Trivett, President
Future Farmers of America
Route 2, Box 84-F
Ladysmith, Virginia 22501

United States Catholic Conference
Division of Youth Activities
1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Honorable Carolyn Warner
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Vincent T. Wasilewski, President
National Association of Broadcasters
1771 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Edward Weaver, Executive Director
American Public Welfare Association
1155 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mrs. Cynthia Wedel
The American National Red Cross
4800 Fillmore Avenue
Alexandria, Virginia 22311

James Whitfield, Director
American Legion
700 North Pennsylvania Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206

Dr. James Wood, Jr., Executive Director
Baptist Joint Committee in Public Affairs
200 Maryland Avenue, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

Julia B. Woodland, Principal
Dunbar Senior High School
1400 Orleans Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21231

Sara-Alyce P. Wright
General Secretary
YWCA of the U.S.A.
600 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Walter Wriston
First National City Bank
399 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Raul Yzaguirre, National Director
National Council on La Raza
1025 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Jerrold R. Zacharias
Education Development Center
15 Mifflin Place
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

APPENDIX D

Task Force Members

January 1977

TASK FORCE ON CITIZEN EDUCATION

Dr. Freeman Butts
Visiting Distinguished
Professor of Education
San Jose University

Dr. William Coplin
Director, Public Affairs Program
Syracuse University

Dr. Badi Foster
Visiting Professor
Afro-American Studies Department
Harvard

Dr. H. Field Haviland
Professor
Fletcher School of International
Politics
Tufts University

Dr. Sheila Koeppen
Educational Affairs
American Political Science
Association

Dr. Brian Larkin
Executive Director
National Council for the
Social Studies

Mr. James I. Luck
Fellow
Academy for Contemporary
Problems

Dr. Howard Mehlinger
Director
Social Studies Development
Center
Indiana University

Mr. Chuck Quigley
Executive Director
Law in a Free Society

Dr. Richard Remy
Director, Citizenship
Development Program
Mershon Center
Ohio State University

Dr. Judith V. Torney
Professor of Psychology
University of Illinois at
Chicago Circle

Citizen Education Staff, OE

Dr. George Vroom
Mr. Logan Sallada
Ms. Elizabeth Farquhar
Mr. George Lowe